DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 832 HE 005 426

AUTHOR Millet, John D.
TITLE Strengthening Community in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D. C. Management Div.
PUB DATE May 74
NOTE 98p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; College Students; *Educational Change; *Educational Objectives; *Governance; Governing Boards; *Higher Education; Leadership; *Management

ABSTRACT

Governance, purposes, and management are not issues isolated from one another; rather, these are elements of a continuous process on which the survival of higher education depends. Chapter 1, Purposes and Objectives, reviews the context of leadership and performance, the purposes of higher education, the objectives and internal conflict, and the concept of organizational structure. Chapter 2, Governance of Institutions, discusses the momentum for change, the governing board, faculty and student participation, administration, and the community council. Chapter 3, Governance of Systems, reviews the multicampus systems and State boards of higher education. Chapter 4, Management and Performance, discusses academic management, academic support services, student support services, institutional support services, and institutional management. Chapter 5, Leadership, emphasizes presidents and leadership for the future. Chapter 6, Alternatives of Choice, identified most troublesome issues of leadership and governance within a college or university and suggests some alternative choices. (MJM)

ED 090832

STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

John D. Millett

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE005426

MD
MANAGEMENT DIVISION
ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.

The Academy is a nonprofit planning organization

STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

John D. Millett

Contents

Preface

1. Purposes and Objectives
2. Governance of Institutions
3. Governance of Systems
4. Management and Performance
5. Leadership
6. Alternatives of Choice

An Ordinance of Government

Bibliography

Preface

Strengthening Community in Higher Education has developed from several complementary concerns which attracted my attention during my first year away from direct higher education administration in 1972-1973. Problems of governance and leadership were continuing to plague many of the college and university campuses which I had occasion to visit. Academic administrators I talked with expressed foreboding about the pressures for institutional restructuring without extensive and adequate discussion of the issues involved. In addition, the appearance of two reports by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and of a policy statement by the Committee for Economic Development (CED) afforded me a reason to put on paper the thoughts contained herein. In its reports on governance (1973) and on the purposes and performance of higher education (1973), the Carnegie Commission set down certain observations and recommendations which need to be related to each other. The CED policy statement on the management and financing of colleges (1973) offers several useful ideas without acknowledging the complexities of governance within colleges and universities. Governance, purposes, and management are not issues isolated from one another. On the contrary, these are elements of a continuous process upon which the very survival of higher education depends.

As I reviewed various books and articles published in the past ten years or so about governance and leadership, I became increasingly convinced of the need to expand the discussion. I found others who agreed with this belief. *Strengthening Community in Higher Education* is an effort to meet this need, to encourage further consideration of the subject, and to offer a model as one possible answer to issues of vital importance. In particular, I want to emphasize three propositions: that power exists and is exercised to achieve specified purposes; that purposes without performance are meaningless; and that leadership is the indispensable ingredient for the determination of purpose and for the accomplishment of desired ends. Surely these are propositions of equal im-

portance to faculty, students, administrators, and all others interested in how higher education serves individuals and society.

I have been fortunate that my interest and concern fit appropriately into the definition of duties as director of the Management Division of the Academy for Educational Development (AED), the program of which is largely supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. It does not always happen that one is able to fit current interests and professional obligations into a single activity.

Furthermore, I have been fortunate in receiving substantial encouragement in the writing of this book from my colleagues within AED. Alvin C. Eurich, the president, has been most supportive in many ways, especially in giving the manuscript a careful reading. One could not ask for or expect a more congenial or more helpful person with whom to be associated.

Similarly, I wish to acknowledge the assistance I received from the members of the policy panel of the Management Division who urged me to pursue my interest in the subject of governance and leadership and to develop this interest as a book for further discussion by academic personnel. In particular, I want to express appreciation for extensive comments and criticisms to Howard R. Bowen, Harold B. Gores, Vivian W. Henderson, Herbert E. Longenecker, James A. Perkins, Paul C. Reinert, Byron K. Trippett, Roger J. Voskuyl, and Logan Wilson. In addition to these individuals, I have had the benefit of extremely helpful comments from John J. Corson.

I wish to thank Helen Weinland and Winifred Thompson for editorial assistance and for help with the bibliography. My secretary, Patricia Brown, has been patient with the typing requirements. As is customary on these occasions, I must hasten to add that all these persons and others must be absolved from any responsibility for the contents. The word and the deed are my own.

Washington, D. C.
May 1974

John D. Millett

STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

1 Purposes and Objectives

In recent years, there has been a veritable flood of statements, books, pamphlets, and articles about the operation of higher education. In part, this attention was prompted by the sudden realization of that academic revolution so clearly portrayed by Jencks and Riesman (1968). In part, it arose from an effort to comprehend the unique organizational characteristics of colleges and universities. Because of faculty insistence and the student activism of the 1960s, institutions were compelled to review and even restructure their arrangements for decision-making. Being itself an intellectual enterprise, higher education gave birth to an extensive literature about its organizational practices.

For the publicly sponsored college and university, this preoccupation with structure occurred in the wake of two other forces of immense importance. One was the tremendous expansion of student enrollment in the 1960s, which became the obligation primarily of the public institutions. While total enrollment in American higher education increased from 3.6 million students in the autumn of 1960 to nearly 8 million in the autumn of 1970, enrollment in public colleges and universities advanced from 2.1 million to 5.8 million students. The second force resulted from this increase. Because the primary burden of planning for and supporting this enrollment expansion fell upon the state governments, they had to explore and develop new administrative arrangements for public higher education. No longer simply an internal problem for the public college and university, governance became a concern of states having to operate multiple campus systems.

Few participants in or observers of the academic scene believe that the problems of governance have all been resolved. On the contrary, many think that the issues will remain troublesome for many years to come. Troyer (1972) observes that the educational processes expected of a college or university are more likely to be invoked by "ventures in governance reform" carried out with "unhurried deliberation" than by governance ventures born in a "highly charged climate,

hurriedly planned, and quickly consummated." Some colleges and universities that hastily and unsatisfactorily restructured their distribution of power in 1968 or 1969 are beginning to review the consequences. Some that avoided a restructuring in the late 1960s must still confront questions about desirable changes in the 1970s. The problems of governance are persistent, and leaders in higher education need to work continually to perfect the process of government and performance in a college or university.

CONTEXT OF LEADERSHIP AND PERFORMANCE

As I review the great spate of writing about academic leadership, governance, and management, I believe it has two major deficiencies, both of which arise from a preoccupation with power rather than with other equally vital concerns. The first is a separation of power from purpose; the second is a separation of power from performance. Both deficiencies can be fatal.

Governance, management, and leadership are not ends in themselves. Much of the discussion about these matters tends to overlook the purposes of a college or university and views power as an end in itself. Some writers appear to assume that if only the dispossessed of the academic community (typically identified as the faculty, students, and staff) were at last endowed with power there would be no further problems for the community, or, if there were, there would be no difficulty in resolving them. The ends to be served by the exercise of power are generally ignored in these writings. The advocates of a restructuring of power apparently assume that only its faulty distribution prevents the satisfactory resolution of issues of purpose.

Similarly, the need for performance of work in an enterprise like the college or university is often overlooked. Power is a heady possession, conferring status, prestige, and perhaps other rewards upon the leaders who direct its exercise. But power divorced from action, work activity, and distribution of the resulting benefits is meaningless. What leaders *accomplish* in the exercise of power is the critical test of social institutions, and accomplishment means producing goods and services. This is the goal of any structure of governance and management.

One would think that the American experience in government ought to serve as a warning of the possibilities that power can be abused and that our capacity to enact laws can outpace our capacity to deliver needed services. The preamble of the Constitution of the United States is a reminder of the importance of purpose in a structure of governance. But periodically individual and partisan welfare is placed ahead of the general welfare. And there is not a city in our country where the delivery of services has not fallen short of needs. These examples of our failures in political governance might well give us pause before we accept some of the ready assumptions of academic governance.

I propose to emphasize that governance in higher education must above all be concerned with purpose, that management must be concerned with performing services, and that leadership must be concerned with decisions about purpose and performance. In this connection, I hope to advance understanding by ob-

serving certain distinctions in the use of terms, defined as follows:

Purposes, for our discussion here, are the broadly conceived ends to be achieved by a social institution or enterprise such as an individual college or university. Purposes are the expression of judgments about desirable goals and about what things are needed, useful, good, and just.

Objectives are the more specific goals or outcomes to be accomplished by a resolution of conflicts over purpose and by the adoption of a program of action. Objectives determine particular work to be performed, processes to be utilized, and resources to be tapped.

Governance is the process of decision-making by which basic policies are determined concerning objectives, programs, benefits, standards, and resources. Governance is a procedure for relating power to purpose, and for exercising power responsibly. It should seek the general welfare through expression of the general will.

Management is the process of delivering the services of a college or university. It is the development of work programs; the employment of techniques necessary for performance; the provision and use of resources of people, plant, equipment, and support services for the accomplishment of objectives. Management is getting a job done.

Leadership is the process of encouraging and persuading those involved in governance to decide and those involved in management to perform. Ideally, leadership seeks objectives that embody purpose and seeks effective performance to achieve these objectives. Thus academic leadership seeks positive, definite, desirable, and timely decisions in the best interest of those who are served by higher education as well as of those who serve.

Organization is the structural arrangement which provides for the processes of governance, management, and leadership. It is a bringing together of purpose and people. Organization is the structure of power and work activity. More than an arrangement for formulating purpose, it is an arrangement for translating purpose into performance. The indispensable structural element for achieving this essential linkage is leadership.

Obviously, governance, management, leadership, and organization are all interrelated in the endeavor to formulate the purposes and to accomplish the objectives of higher education. At the same time, I believe it desirable and useful to keep the four concepts separate and distinguishable. Too often the term *governance* is employed without a precise definition. As a consequence, concerns such as management and leadership are slighted or omitted, with disappointing outcomes from action based upon inadequate discussion.

If I may be permitted another historical analogy, I would observe that much of the effort in recent years within colleges and universities to devise new instruments of governance is reminiscent of the Articles of Confederation of 1777. It seems likely that these same colleges and universities will eventually seek to formulate a constitution. And perhaps in some instances it will be possible to write one without first having to struggle through the experience of Articles of Confederation.

PURPOSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

There is one and only one criterion of evaluation for governance, management, leadership, and organization: do they effectively and satisfactorily achieve their objectives? This test demands continual reappraisal—the answer today may not be the answer tomorrow. The answer is always critical to the evaluation of the legitimacy and adequacy of social institutions.

Customarily, colleges and universities articulate their goals at the beginning of their catalogues. Unfortunately, these statements of purpose often have been given too little consideration within the academic community itself. Sometimes any correspondence between these statements of purpose and the actual performance of the academic enterprise is purely coincidental. I have a general impression, however, that colleges and universities have begun to give greater care to the articulation of their purposes. No doubt this effort has been stimulated by questions about the legitimacy of some activities, such as research for national defense and consultation only to those groups able to pay for it. Moreover, this articulation of purpose has been attempted as an exercise in consensus-building among the various interests within the academic community. It is reassuring to observe, for example, no matter how rarely, that the statement of purpose in the catalogue is the joint product of a committee of faculty, students, and administrators and has been approved by the board of trustees. In at least one instance, I have even found a statement of purpose supplemented by a declaration of the philosophical premises upon which these purposes were based. Such accord is still the exception rather than the rule, and much remains to be achieved in this endeavor.

Much of the controversy about governance within colleges and universities is in reality a conflict about purposes. Some participants in the controversy have preferred to present their cause as one involving only power when in fact it has involved purpose. In one long and bitter battle about governance of a university, where certain students and faculty members wished to change the relationship between the institution and society, one of the participants reported to me that the conflict was over purpose. The real issue, he said, was what service was rendered society, rather than who possessed power within the university.

To be implemented, purposes must be reflected in governance. Statements of purpose are more than an inducement for student enrollment: they set forth the commitments, the obligations, the outputs to which the enterprise is dedicated and to which all its constituent groups should pledge their best efforts. It is not enough for a college or university to announce purposes in its catalogue; the institution should also incorporate them in its instrument or ordinance of governance, and base policy decisions on them. Above all, it should exhibit them in its performance.

Purpose and performance were linked in the work of the Assembly on University Goals and Governance recently sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The assignment of the Assembly in bringing together goals and governance was both realistic and imperative in that it acknowledged the primacy of purpose and the necessity of performance. In its first report (1971), the Assembly presented some forty-seven "theses" which had to do with the goals of

higher education. These included such matters as access to higher education, alternatives to higher education for youth, the interrelationship of learning and experience, the relationship between higher education and professional practice, the importance of teaching, the reforming of general education, the conduct of research, and the need for research about education itself. The goals in the report may appear somewhat diffuse and unequal in importance; but the Assembly clearly established the appropriate relationship between these purposes and the performance of colleges and universities.

This discussion of purposes was further advanced by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in its report on *The Purposes and the Performance of Higher Education in the United States* (1973a). The Commission postulated five major purposes: (1) the education of the individual student and the provision of a constructive environment for developmental growth; (2) the advancement of human capability in society at large; (3) educational justice for the postsecondary age group; (4) pure learning to support intellectual and artistic creativity; (5) the evaluation of society for self-renewal through individual thought and persuasion.

It has been customary to speak of the ends of higher education as instruction, research, and public service—or sometimes as the transmission, advancement, and utilization of knowledge. These ideas are preserved in the Carnegie Commission formulation with two additional items: educational justice, or equal access, and constructive criticism of society. These are important, helpful additions.

With these additions, the Commission's report addresses what appears to be the greatest single source of conflict within colleges and universities today: what is the appropriate relationsnip between higher education and society? All those involved in this conflict agree completely that society should provide increased financial support to both institutions of higher education and individual students. When the question turns to the obligations of higher education to society in return for this nurture, however, the agreement disappears. On the one hand, there are those who hold that higher education must remain essentially neutral amid the social conflicts of the day and continue to perform its chores of instruction, research, and public service. What individuals and groups may do with these products is outside the control or influence of colleges and universities. On the other hand, there are those who see higher education aligned with the powerful, the wealthy, and the influential. They see the impact of these groups causing the major flaws which have brought about an immoral, imperialist, racist society. These critics demand either a termination of services to the powerful or an inauguration of equal services to the less powerful.

The Carnegie Commission report acknowledged this conflict by asserting that one of the major purposes of higher education was the evaluation of society in the context of its endeavor to achieve self-renewal. The context might equally have been that of a social commitment to progress; but the Commission preferred the term *evaluation* to *criticism*, and it preferred Gardner's concept (1964) of self-renewal to that of progress. At the same time, the Commission placed an important limitation upon evaluation for self-renewal. It insisted that this purpose was to be achieved through individual thought and persuasion and specifically rejected direct political action by colleges and universities. The

arguments used against such action included the contentions that the free pursuit of knowledge would be inconsistent with a commitment to a single social cause, that a single commitment would promote internal conflict and "tear institutions of higher education apart," that it would be counter-productive and might even delay desirable social change, and that faculty members and students were not foreclosed from joining such causes they might espouse as individuals.

I believe the Carnegie Commission overlooked the two most convincing arguments for its position. First of all, colleges and universities have seldom been able to agree upon the best action to promote their own self interest through increased income. What reason is there to believe that they would suddenly be able to agree upon the desirable social actions designed to eliminate poverty, pollution, international conflict, inflation, and a shortage of energy? Moreover, if higher education were to assume that its intelligence about things political exceeds that of any other social institution, then it would have to claim a superiority to all other social institutions and thus encourage the destruction of the pluralism indispensable to individual freedom in society. Second, in its discussion of purposes, the Carnegie Commission avoided any reference to the financial support of higher education. But this support is a fact of life which must be openly and candidly acknowledged. As of 1973-1974, institutions of higher education as enterprises have income for current operations in the neighborhood of 30 billion dollars. Nearly 60 percent of this income is provided through government and philanthropy. If higher education no longer provided services to society equally because it had abandoned its political neutrality, would this social support be continued? The answer is probably no. If this support were discontinued, how would the income to operate colleges and universities be obtained?

The role of higher education as a major social institution for the evaluation of other social institutions is all the more effective when a stance of political neutrality is proclaimed and maintained. The consequence is political non-alignment with any other social grouping, and the provision of services to all. Every voluntary group in society competing for political advantage is expected to promote its own self-interest. The neutral position of higher education has apparently served society well in the past, and has produced a widespread consensus in society about the desirability of adequate support for institutions and students. At the same time faculty members and others have had considerable freedom to develop their own moral and intellectual standards for the evaluation of our social institutions. This has been no mean achievement.

OBJECTIVES AND INTERNAL CONFLICT

However the purposes of a college or university may be defined in broad scope, the problem of translating purposes into specific objectives still remains. Agreement about general purposes establishes the framework for the discussion and the determination of objectives. A statement of purposes is only a beginning, a set of guidelines. Purposes must be further defined in terms of specific

objectives to be achieved through specific programs. The continual concern of governance should be policy choices that formulate objectives and specify programs.

Unlike the Assembly on Goals and Governance, the Carnegie Commission in its 1973 report on purposes did not review or outline the policy choices that must be made in the process of governance within a college or university. Each of the five major purposes enumerated by the Commission present, in fact, innumerable choices. Because purposes are not self-fulfilling or self-executing, much still remains to be resolved even when they appear to be generally accepted. Several commentaries about higher education have identified the conflicting interests about objectives which complicate the process of governance and impede the performance of work. Sanders (1973) declares that there is a clear-cut dichotomy of interest within the academic community between faculty and administration, younger faculty and older faculty, tenured faculty and nontenured faculty, faculty committed to intellectual endeavor and faculty committed to social action, faculty concerned with knowledge and students concerned with job credentials, bright students and average students, instruction and research, the curriculum and the extracurriculum, the university and society, and community and authority. Anyone familiar with the operation of colleges and universities will recognize the existence of these conflicts and be able to enlarge the listing. The virulence of conflict has varied among institutions.

In some instances conflict about objectives among various interests has been so vigorous that a perceptive participant like Wise (1971) has concluded that there is no longer any attempt to have a functioning government within many colleges and universities. Wise finds the justification for his conclusion in the inability of institutions to decide what programs to undertake and what programs to abandon, how to allocate resources among competing programs upon some rational scheme of priorities, what academic qualifications to require of students, what student performance standards to require for award of a degree. Wise argues that colleges and universities are avoiding making decisions on these issues and insists that the absence of governance has been elevated to a principle of operation. Perhaps observations of this same sort led Cohen and March (1974) to label the academic community an "organized anarchy."

Baldridge (1971b) argues that a university must be viewed essentially as a political arena in which various faculty groups, students groups, and administrators engage in a power struggle to advance their own distinct interests, values, and objectives. Each group must not only seek to achieve its vision of the desirable but also endeavor to thwart all contrary visions. Baldridge finds that the social structure of a university is pluralistic, conflict is a normal way of life, decision-making is a legislative process involving negotiation and compromise, and the end product of governance is legislation that managers must implement. At least in this interpretation of the academic community, Baldridge believes that decision-making is possible, that objectives can be determined through a compromise of interests, and that work performance can be accomplished through management.

Without offering any evaluation of the issues themselves, Gross (in Baldridge, 1971a) has endeavored to clarify the conflict about the objectives of higher

education through a classification of goals. Under the heading of output goals he lists student-expressive objectives, student-instrumental objectives, research objectives, and public service objectives. Under the heading of adaptation goals Gross lists college response to its environment, including such objectives as ensuring external support, instructing the best available academic talent or a wide range of academic talent, to provide services desired by outside groups, and to operate at reasonable cost. Among the management goals Gross enumerates such objectives as faculty and student involvement in governance, maintenance of internal harmony, payment of adequate salaries, and evidence of work performance. Under the label of motivational goals Gross includes objectives like the protection of academic freedom, the promotion of career satisfaction, the encouragement of student rights, the development of institutional loyalty, and the cultivation of pride in institutional achievement. This listing of objectives is useful in at least two ways. First, it suggests the wide range of issues to be resolved through a process of governance, and second, it points to the possibility of conflict among objectives. The objectives of a college or university may not always be internally consistent with each other.

The fact of conflicting ideas and interests within an academic community makes the structure of governance, management, and leadership all the more vital. These processes must resolve conflicts among objectives, or the viability and existence of colleges and universities as enterprises will be threatened.

PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION

In recent years the subject of organization, or bureaucracy as a synonym for organization, has commanded extensive interest from sociologists and other behavioral scientists. For the most part the study of organization has had as its object the corporation, the governmental agency, the church, the military, hospitals, or the university. These enterprises have had at least one characteristic in common: they have all been engaged in the output of goods or the delivery of services. But organization embraces structures of representation and participation for resolving social conflict as well as structures for producing goods and services.

The usual approach to the study of organization is evident in the "inventory of scientific findings" presented by Berelson and Steiner (1964). The authors find that the major characteristics of organization are formality, hierarchy, size and complexity, and duration. These principal findings are elaborated in a series of additional and subordinate propositions. Gross (1968) has written that a major paradox of our time is that while organizations have become increasingly important as a means for meeting human needs, they have at the same time become less manageable. He believes that conflict within an organization has become inevitable, that authority must be exercised with caution, and that there are persistent myths such as that good techniques mean good management. Gross argues that there are limits to rationality in organized endeavor and projects a dynamic of conflict rather than a fixed pattern of group behavior.

In a major study of college and university organization, Blau (1973) explored the similarities between the structures of government agencies and private businesses and those of higher education. He found evidence of bureaucracy within a university in its division of labor, administrative hierarchy, and clerical apparatus. He also noted within universities the absence of detailed operating rules and direct supervision of work output. By means of multiple correlations he found that the degree of bureaucratization in a university reduced the rate at which students made progress toward a degree, that a higher rate of college graduation meant a higher rate of student entry into graduate study, and that faculty orientation outside the university encouraged the development of graduate education. Blau declared that the reputation of an institution was correlated positively with research productivity, that enrollment size was correlated with research activity, that faculty research activity increased faculty power, and that faculty research was correlated with management decentralization. He pointed out that the more income a university had the larger the faculty was, that the more extensive the library holdings the larger the clerical staff was and the higher faculty salaries were. Blau professed that an unresolved question of academic structure was how to integrate diverse departments, institutes, centers, schools, and colleges into a university whole. Blau also acknowledged various dilemmas confronting the academic enterprise: the relative allocation of resources to bright students versus average or weaker students; the allocation of effort between instruction and research; the distribution of effort between basic research and applied research; the relationship of faculty quality to faculty salaries; and the promotion of faculty loyalty.

I mention this sampling of inquiry into the nature of organizations, including the nature of academic organization, in order to emphasize once more the concerns of this discussion. I believe that many students of human behavior in formal organization structures have failed to distinguish between the processes of resolving conflicts about purpose and objectives and those of producing goods and services. It is obvious what we have reached a stage of social development where production alone has ceased to be the all-demanding preoccupation of persons and groups. Individuals in producing enterprises want a voice also in determining objectives and work programs.

Organization has become equally concerned today with the process of deciding on objectives as with the process of producing goods and services. In fact, I fear there is currently a danger that in our interest in debating objectives we may overlook the importance of production. Organization has now become a task in developing a linkage between objectives, management, and leadership, in the context of major purposes. I believe an integration of the components of organization within our academic communities is now our most important single challenge. It can be realized only if we maintain an appropriate balance between governance, management, and leadership.

2 Governance of Institutions

In the closing years of the 1950s, the Carnegie Corporation, aware of changes taking place in faculty power, decided to examine the decision-making process in colleges and universities and retained a distinguished management consultant, John J. Corson, to undertake the study (1960). The major finding of this study was that there existed an "organizational dualism" in academic governance – that is, most institutions had a governance structure with two principal parts: one for administrative decision-making and another for faculty decision-making. The basic assumption was that there was a workable distinction between administrative and faculty matters. Somehow, some way, these two kinds of decision-making were expected not to conflict, and they were widely believed to reflect the realities of power within a college or university. For example, in an empirical inquiry into the matter of administrative decision-making versus faculty decision-making, Demerath, Stephens, and Taylor (1967) identified twelve major policy areas requiring decision-making, which were ranked in terms of faculty influence. The four areas in which faculty influence were found to be high were: faculty appointments, faculty promotions, selection of department chairmen, and faculty work assignments. Six areas were of medium faculty influence: selection of deans, selection of academic administrators, admissions standards, preparation of the budget, student discipline, and university public relations. The two areas of low faculty influence were the construction and maintenance of buildings and the conduct of intercollegiate athletics. In the areas of medium or low faculty influence, the authority of administrative officers was rated medium or high.

In a response to Corson's study I offered a somewhat different interpretation (Millett, 1962). I suggested that there were at least four constituencies in the academic community: the faculty, the student body, the administration, and the alumni. I further argued that the vitality of any given academic community depended upon the capacity of these four constituencies to achieve a workable

consensus about purposes, objectives, and programs. It was not clear in my own mind, as several critics hastened to point out, exactly how this consensus was to be achieved, but I was certain that some such consensus was absolutely essential to the continued functioning of a college or university.

Historically, however, administrators have dominated decision-making among these four groups. Two explanations have been offered for the importance of this administrative role in governance. One has to do with financial support; the other has to do with growing faculty specialization and intellectual competence. In the long history of American higher education recounted by such authors as Brubacher and Rudy (1958), Rudolph (1962), and Veysey (1965), it appears that boards of trustees and presidents were the critical force that developed the philanthropic underpinning for American higher education as it existed until the beginning of World War II. For the private university, as distinguished from public or private colleges, endowment and gift income were the major sources of support until the days of the returning veterans in 1946. And in the state universities, influential board members with the assistance of the university president sought and obtained financial support from state governors and state legislators (Laird, 1972).

Snyder (1972) offers a second explanation for administrative decision-making. He suggests that administrative authority was the only structural device competent to cope with the variety of objectives, the diversity of schools, colleges, and other academic units, and the complexity of activities that developed in the American university after 1900. The university was no longer a community of scholars of common goals, common interests, and common concerns. As the United States developed professional groups and accumulated economic surpluses for domestic investment after World War I, its universities undertook more and more specialized programs of instruction to serve this new social structure and economy. Within the framework of the traditional arts and sciences, the interests and the competencies of faculty members grew farther apart. The authority of administrative decision-making was the only force providing any sense of unity amid all this diversity.

But this administrative authority did not go unchallenged in the years after World War II. The events of the 1960s on many different campuses demonstrated not only that faculty members were convinced that administrative authority needed restriction, but also that students expected to share authority with both faculty and administration. It became apparent that there was no longer a workable consensus of the various constituencies of the academic community about governance; and as student groups challenged both faculty and administrative authority, it became obvious that a dual organizational structure would no longer be sufficient. The legitimacy of both faculty and administrative authority was questioned; the location of authority to respond to student grievances was confused; and it was not clear whether responsibility for the maintenance of law and order belonged to faculty or administration. Under the circumstances, many colleges and universities began to seek some kind of change in their structure of governance.

MOMENTUM FOR CHANGE

Late in the 1950s the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) established a Committee T on College and University Government, which submitted a report (American Association of University Professors, 1960) setting forth a "statement of principles" for faculty participation in university governance. This statement declared that the basic functions of a college or university—to augment, preserve, transmit, and criticize knowledge and to foster creativity—were performed by a community of scholars who must be free to exercise their independent judgment in planning and executing their educational assignment. It recognized three groups as having important roles in the government of a college or university: the faculty, the administration, and the governing board. The statement called for a careful delineation of the role of each group in university government and declared that no one group had any "exclusive claim" to represent society in the conduct of higher education. In fact, it was asserted that "actual practices" of college and university operation generally recognized the joint authority of faculties, administrators, and governing boards.

The AAUP statement then set forth six "principles" to clarify the appropriate role of faculty authority in college and university government. First, there should be faculty representation at each level of academic decision-making—the department, the school or college, the university, and the university system—and direct communication between faculty representatives and the governing board. Second, the faculty should have "major responsibility" for educational and research policies, including admission standards, student affairs, curricula, and degree requirements. Third, there should be a "direct role" for the faculty in the making of budget decisions "at all levels." Fourth, appointments, promotions, and dismissals of academic personnel should be made only with "active faculty participation." Fifth, academic administrators, such as department chairmen, academic deans, and presidents, should be selected only with faculty participation. And sixth, faculty members "should share" with board members and administrators "the task of maintaining institutional relations with the public."

Two or three years after the publication of this report, the AAUP invited the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges to join it in preparing a joint position on college and university government (American Association of University Professors, 1966). This 1966 statement began with a call for "mutual understanding" about college and university government, then endorsed the need for participation of faculty, administration, and governing board in determining "general educational policy." It suggested "joint endeavor" in long-range planning, in developing plans for physical facilities, in budgeting, in selecting a president, in appointing other academic officers, and in external relations. It then set forth certain general duties of a governing board, emphasized the "institutional leadership" role of the president, and asserted that the faculty has "primary responsibility" for curriculum, methods of instruction, research, faculty status, degree requirements, and "those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process." Agencies for faculty participation should be established "at each level where faculty responsibility is present."

The 1966 joint statement recognized, whereas the 1960 AAUP statement did not, the possibility of student interest in college or university government. The joint statement urged that when students desired "to participate responsibly" in government, their wish should be recognized as an opportunity for student education and involvement in the affairs of their college and university. The statement went on: "Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness." It enumerated limitations to such participation – inexperience, untested capacity, transitory status, and student subjection to faculty evaluation – but recommended that at a minimum, students should have the freedom to discuss policy and operation without fear of reprisal, the right to due process when charged with a violation of regulations, and the privilege to hear speakers of their own choice.

The next year the Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiation of the American Association for Higher Education declared that faculty discontent had become evident in many institutions, especially in public junior colleges and the emerging four-year colleges and universities, and identified the sources of this discontent as the faculty desire to participate in the determination of policies affecting professional status and performance and faculty concern about the establishment of state boards of higher education with their threat to local autonomy (1967). This task force advocated "shared authority" between faculty and administration, exercised preferably through an academic senate, of which faculty members should constitute a clear majority. This academic senate should resolve most matters of college or university concern, although some issues, such as grading standards, should be "primarily under faculty control," while some other issues, such as business management, should be "primarily under the control of the administrators." The report urged that the senate establish a special budget committee "to deal with the general allocation of resources" among the component programs of the college or university. The senate should rely upon information-sharing and appeals to reason as the "preferred approach" to resolving faculty-administration disputes. Political, educational, and economic sanctions were mentioned as other means of resolving "serious disputes."

In two other respects the 1967 report elaborated the earlier documents. It recognized the emergence of faculty collective bargaining upon the American academic scene, and, although little was said about such bargaining, it stated that "formal bargaining relationships between the faculty and the administration are most likely to develop if the administration has failed to establish or support effective internal organizations for faculty representation." The report further urged that academic senates create a "formal appeals procedure" to resolve disputes between individual faculty members and the administration. It pointed out that such a grievance procedure might provide for "neutral third-party intervention," including arbitration. In a further comment about collective bargaining, the report observed: "the relationships between the bargaining agency and the senate probably will be highly unstable."

In its statement about governance (1971), the Assembly on University Goals and Governance acknowledged that a college or university is an "intricate organization," involving trustees, administrators, students, professors, staff, alumni,

legislators, and public officials, and declared, "Good governance depends on a reasonable allocation of responsibilities that makes the structure of authority credible for all these groups." The Assembly refused to propose any particular procedures to this end; rather, it declared that the educational mission of the university was most likely to be accomplished if there were a division of authority, a sharing of information, and a well-defined system of accountability. It then asserted that "too few" colleges and universities had developed these characteristics in their structure of governance.

The Assembly report also set forth a number of "theses" about university governance. The legal authority of the lay governing board was accepted, with board members to be more widely representative of women, blacks, and other groups. Although its report did not endorse student and faculty representation on a governing board, on the grounds that such membership might encourage board intervention in "day-to-day academic decisions," it did suggest that faculty members from other universities and young alumni might be appointed as board members. It recognized the unique importance of the college or university presidency and urged that the office should be strengthened in order to represent the "general interest" of the university as a whole and to offer faculty leadership.

The Assembly urged that the faculty and administrative systems of university governance should be combined into a "system of delegated, responsive governance." A limited term of not more than a "dozen years" was advocated for all academic administrators, with one point of review in this period. Faculty members were urged to give greater attention to the work of faculty senates and faculty committees. It was argued that when student and faculty members were joined in a unicameral legislature, their separate bodies should continue in existence. Student government was said to be a "misnomer"; the greatest possibility of student influence upon educational policy would occur on a "decentralized basis." Alumni should be regularly informed about college or university concerns. And colleges and universities should have an official journal of the actions of their various governing bodies.

Finally, in its report on governance (1973a), the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education reviewed the conflicts within higher education and urged a "new consensus" on campus governance. It recommended that governors or other state officials reviewing public college and university budgets should not sit on their governing boards, that members of governing boards should be subject to careful screening prior to appointment or selection, and that faculty members, students, and alumni should participate in nominating board members. It recommended further that faculty and students should not be members of governing boards where employed or enrolled, but that boards should include faculty and student members on board committees. Boards should periodically review the arrangements for governance to make certain they meet the needs of the institution; they should seek "active" presidents, give them the authority to provide leadership in a time of change and conflict, and establish stated review periods for the presidents.

Faculties, the report urged, should have participative authority in university governance; state laws should permit faculty collective bargaining; faculty

contributing to the support of the college or university (but only a few contributed large sums). According to this survey, these trustees considered higher education to be a privilege and not a right, thought there should be a higher educational opportunity for all high school graduates, favored free inquiry on campus, opposed campus disruption, considered teaching effectiveness on the part of faculty members to be more important than publications, desired the institution to serve as a cultural center for the community, believed that a college or university should be as much concerned with values as with student intellectual development, and expected the president to be an educational leader rather than merely a mediator. In the perception of their role as trustees they saw themselves as little involved in academic and student affairs and as principally involved with finances, fund-raising, and development of the physical plant.

Various manuals and handbooks prepared for the guidance of college and university trustees—including Hughes (1943), Rauh (1959, 1969), Burns (1966), Henderson (1967), an annual report of the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1961-1962), and the bulletins of the Association of Governing Boards—have all tended to emphasize four themes. More recently, a trustee of the California state university system, Heilbron (1973) has provided a kind of guide book on the correct behavior of trustees. Amid his various observations on issues trustees must consider, one finds a general acceptance of these same positions. First, the lay governing board is justified as a useful device for insulating a college or university from social pressure and political control. Second, the governing board should not interfere in academic matters. Third, the trustees have no more important task than to select the "right" person as president of the institution. Fourth, it is hoped that trustees may help raise money for the institution, some may even make sizeable contributions on their own. Fifth and most important, trustees have been encouraged to think in terms of that organizational dualism identified by Corson. Decision-making authority on academic affairs belongs to the faculty. It is hoped that the president may provide some leadership for the faculty, and he is expected to present to the lay governing board matters primarily of finances, plant development, fund-raising, and general operation. Where conflict did arise between the board and the faculty, the issue almost always involved, as Corbally (1970) pointed out, selective intervention by the board into matters of faculty personnel or student behavior where the board believed that faculty or student action violated certain imprecise standards which seemed socially desirable to the board members.

Because of the number of incidents wherein desirable social conduct was interpreted one way by faculty and student groups and another way by governing boards, various proposals for changing the composition of the board were put forth in the 1960s. Interestingly enough, these proposals seldom advocated any change in the board's legal authority to exercise the power of government. Instead, these proposals urged that if boards of trustees were to decide, for faculty members and students, what constituted socially acceptable behavior, faculty and students should be added to their membership and that boards should be more widely representative of American society. It was sometimes assumed (without evidence to substantiate the proposition) that boards with more

be the case, then a new structure of governance of a shared and cooperative endeavor must be designed that permits formalized arrangements for faculty, student, and staff expression of positions and action. Essentially, two major structural arrangements have been considered as a means for sharing the authority of government: to add faculty and student members to the governing board, or to develop a new college or university council or senate with members drawn from faculty, students, administrators, and staff, and to give this new council or senate substantial authority to enact legislation.

It is important to consider these organizational alternatives in terms of purpose. If the authority of the lay governing board is to be extended from past practice to encompass the whole range of policy issues confronting a college or university, it seems desirable for faculty, student, and staff participation; yet if such representatives are added to the membership of the governing board, obviously the board is no longer a lay board. Two developments then are likely to occur. One is that the lay function of the boards in public institutions will more and more be transferred to state boards of higher education or to the political process of state government. The other is that the governing board will become more and more extensively involved in deciding all issues of academic and management policy affecting a college or university. Moreover, in the case of a private institution, if students and faculty are to be represented on the governing board, why should not the state government also have representatives if the state government begins to provide state financial support?

Certainly lay governing boards of colleges and universities could include persons more representative than in the past of women, different age groups, income groups, employment categories, and ethnic backgrounds. Student and faculty membership from other institutions, rather than the institution itself, may be desirable in this process. But if board membership is to be a substitute for political executive and legislative supervision of college and university operations, then board members must continue to give primary attention to the *public* interest in higher education. Thus I believe a community council as a representative body of faculty, students, staff, and administrators offers two organizational advantages over faculty and student representation from the institution on the board of trustees. It can be a larger body than is probably desirable in a governing board, and it provides a forum where the concern is clearly focused upon institutional interest.

FACULTY AND STUDENT PARTICIPATION

The issue whether faculty and students should be members of the governing board does not embrace the question of how much power and authority each group should exercise within an academic community. Faculty authority has been quite substantial in the past thirty-five years. Much less can be said about student authority simply because so little has been evident. Student affairs have been dominated by faculty authority. Student power has found its outlet in protest and disruption rather than in the exercise of a legitimatized authority.

Student power was much in evidence during the 1960s. In the Educational Amendments of 1972, Congress recognized the legitimacy of student power when it recommended that colleges and universities consider the desirability of adding students to their boards. The problem has been how to recognize this power and give it a structured purpose and role just as that of faculty.

There has been a "great growth of faculty power" since World War II (McConnell, 1971b). Moreover, this power has been exercised through a "high degree of professional self-government," as well as through formalized organs of academic decision-making extending to the selection, retention, and promotion of faculty members, the determination of instructional objectives and programs, the development of instructional procedures and workloads, evaluation of student performance, standards of admission, access to instructional programs, and even placement of degree recipients.

The faculty member is the producer of the major services a college or university provides: instruction, research and creative activity, and public service. As an individual he enjoys considerable authority to distribute his energies as he sees fit among these desired outputs. He often decides what particular courses he wishes to offer, how many and what students will be admitted to them, what the instructional objectives of a course shall be, what instructional procedures to employ, and what standards to impose in the evaluation of student achievement.

The most important associational relationship of the individual faculty member in terms of power and governance is the academic department. Departments are criticized for too little interest in undergraduate instruction, in continuing education, and in the public image of the institution; and the management role of the department, as we shall note again later, seems to be neglected or poorly handled. But there has been little factual exploration and analysis of the role of the academic department in institutional governance. In a study of departments of political science in six quite different institutions (1973), I found that these departments enjoyed considerable authority, but that, apart from the selection of personnel, they tended to avoid collective decision-making about instructional objectives, procedures, and results. Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus (1970), in their comprehensive analysis of the university department, acknowledged that they had considerable difficulty in identifying just what authority departments exercised and how they exercised it; yet it was clear that departments exercised extensive authority. For example, they found that deans and academic vice-presidents were not major constraints upon departmental authority but rather supportive links to the larger college or university and defenders of faculty autonomy.

A cynical commentary about academic politics offered by an anonymous faculty member with the literary pseudonym Pandarus (1973) proposes six "principles" of governance: (1) no one has the complete power to do any given thing; (2) real administrative power begins to deteriorate when the administrator makes his first decision; (3) the fundamental allegiance of the faculty member belongs to the smallest unit of which he is a member; (4) for every administrative action there is an equal and opposite reaction; (5) eccentricity is not only to be tolerated in academic life but is considered to be a virtue; and (6) faculty members expect the proper maintenance of the symbols of the college or uni-

versity. There will be many persons who will find realities of faculty behavior in these "principles."

Beyond the department is the college, governmentally most often a collection of departments. In many universities the authority and role of a college are seldom clearly delineated, and colleges exercise minimal authority. The reason is simple: any increase in college authority means a decrease in departmental authority and, faculty members, in general, agree that departmental authority must be maintained. College committees tend to avoid important decisions, such as the desirable objectives and procedures in program instruction, while concentrating upon matters of little moment or of pure routine.

Much the same observation can be made about the authority of faculty senates at the institutional level, where the faculty role becomes one not so much of exercising authority over faculty affairs alone but of ensuring faculty participation in decision-making that concerns the institution as a whole: the budget, the general structure of management, institution-wide personnel policies, the general relationship to students, the public image of the institution.

Howe (1971) refers to the patterns of faculty participation in college and university governance as a "tangled web." He points out the many committees where faculty members keep minutes and waste hours, the increasing restiveness with present structures such as faculty senates, and the belief that collective bargaining may be a way out of existing confusion over the faculty role in institutional decision-making. In a study designed to measure the legitimacy of governance in Pennsylvania institutions, Leslie (1973) found that faculties were generally satisfied with the decision-making process in determining new courses, but were less satisfied about decision-making affecting educational objectives, salary increases, and the allocation of financial resources. He found further that there were substantial differences in attitudes about legitimacy of the decision-making process between state universities, state colleges, and community colleges. Community college faculties tended to rate the legitimacy of the decision-making process higher than did those in the state colleges, while the faculties in the state universities were the least satisfied with the decision-making process.

I sense the cause of faculty confusion and dissatisfaction is the fact that faculty members are insistent upon sharing the exercise of power within a college or university, while at the same time being reluctant to come to grips with the varied interests and issues that must be compromised in the determination of objectives and work programs (see Hickman, 1968, and Dykes, 1968). They thus experience considerable frustration and even alienation in their exposure to the problems of academic decision-making at the institutional level. It is important in the organization of faculty governance, I think, to make a clear distinction between governance and management. This is *not* a distinction between policy planning and policy implementation, but instead the difference between legislation and execution – the difference between the resolution of conflicting interests and work performance. In the field of academic management in particular it appears to me that there has been a notable failure to make this distinction. Academic departments, college faculties, college faculty committees, and faculty senates at large have all tended to think of themselves as both legislators and managers.

It is possible that faculty collective bargaining may clarify this distinction between governance and management which much faculty practice in the past has tended to blur. Collective bargaining agreements are in essence major legislation on the subject of faculty compensation, faculty workload, and faculty operation, while presidents, academic vice-presidents, deans, and department chairmen become managers who must see to the implementation of these agreements. In the absence of collective bargaining and in the areas of academic operation where collective bargaining agreements are silent, some other arrangement is desirable. This arrangement ought to be, I think, a legislative process in which careful consideration is given to the ordinances and rules which prescribe the basic objectives, management structure, and work procedures of the academic enterprise. Furthermore, the exclusive faculty prerogative to decide matters of so-called "academic policy" should give way, I think, to a structure of governance in which all the constituent groups of the academic community are involved.

Of student power and authority, three areas of concern can be clearly perceived. One is student social behavior on campus; another is student residential life, particularly in terms of student housing and use of residential facilities; the third is student involvement in the instructional process.

There is no need here for lengthy discussion of student social life or residential life. For most of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, student social organizations and activities were looked upon as undesirable distractions from academic studies. Generally, after World War I, colleges and universities made their peace with social activities and recognized the extracurriculum as a necessary adjunct of academic life. Since World War II, their major concern has been whether or not social organizations discriminated in their membership on the basis of race, religion, or national origin.

As far as residential life is concerned, students have been concerned about requirements to live in dormitories owned and operated by the institution, about restrictions upon the use of alcohol and other drugs in residence facilities, and about the separation of men from women in residence facilities. For the most part, colleges and universities in the past ten years have abandoned most, if not all, of these restrictions on the grounds that the laws of society rather than the special regulations of an institution shall govern student use of residence facilities. There are still parents and others in society who are not prepared to admit that students at eighteen years of age shall be considered adults in all their interpersonal relationships, but I suspect this number is declining and I hope the warfare about men-women roles on campus and in residence facilities is over.

One troublesome area of conflict on many campuses remains that of institutional sponsorship—and even financial support through student fees—of certain student activities, such as student publications, health service, cultural programs, recreational programs, and intercollegiate athletics. Personally, I believe that the sooner these services are placed on a voluntary basis, bought and sold by the laws of the marketplace, the better for removing a potential cause of conflict. Duscha and Fischer (1973), in their report on the campus press, have pointed the way. Student health services might well be established as Health Maintenance Organizations in which students would voluntarily enter, and similar arrange-

ments in other fields might well be considered.

In this regard, it seems to me that the label *student government* has long been a misnomer, because two of the most important attributes of government, the authority to enact legislation and the authority to levy taxes, have never resided except by institutional permission in student government. Students have been delegated some authority for self-government in housing units, to publish newspapers and yearbooks, to operate certain social enterprises such as dances and concerts, and to form various social groupings. But insofar as student *government* is concerned, the extent of this delegation seems to me to be an appropriate subject for legislation by an academic community council and the governing board.

The major remaining problem is student involvement in decisions concerning instructional objectives and procedures. If we may consider the statements by two student leaders, Powell (1971) and Johnston (1971), as representative, then higher education confronts the prospect of conflict about instructional practices for some time to come. Students are concerned about the control by faculty "experts" of courses, credits, grades, and the whole of "higher learning." They see admissions decisions as political rather than educational judgments. And they expect their educational experience to be relevant to the kind of society they want. Accordingly the problem is how to structure student concern with academic and institutional decision-making (McGrath, 1970). In general, experiments to date have been in the direction of providing student membership on departmental committees, college committees, and community councils. Increasingly, students are having a voice in both academic and institutional affairs, and they are now as concerned with educational issues as with so-called student affairs.

ADMINISTRATION

The third element of the power structure, the administration, is generally thought to comprise the president, various vice-presidents, various assistants, the student personnel staff, the directors of staff and supporting services, and academic deans.

The existence of administrative power is considered a reality, and the controversy of recent years has been over not its extension but its curtailment. In the eyes of many students and some faculty members, the administration is "the enemy," possibly because it seems preoccupied with what it attempts to define as the institutional interest at the expense of the special interest of particular student, faculty, and other groups. Since the power of government is vested in lay boards, and since administrators are the instrument of the lay board, many faculty members and students see the power of government as being exercised by administrators and thus think of administrators as more closely allied to society than to their own needs. Administrators become the symbols of authority, and perhaps in no other social setting is authority more disliked than in an academic community. Faculty members practice one of the few highly indi-

vidualized professions remaining in our society, and students have attained that age where it seems natural to reject authority. For these and other reasons, faculty and students think of administrative authority as hostile and in need of some kind of restriction.

In their study of the American college presidency for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Cohen and March (1974) observed: that the college presidency was a "reactive job," concerned with the attitudes and interests of others; that it was a parochial job, the president normally coming from within the institution or from a similar institution; that college presidents were academics who had had almost all of their careers within academic institutions; that the college presidency was a conventional kind of position to which the president came through "socially conservative" filters; that it was an important position to the president, representing the peak of an academic career; and that the actual role of the president was more symbolic than real in terms of authority and influence. As mentioned earlier, Cohen and March describe the academic community as an "organized anarchy." The characteristics of an organized anarchy are problematical goals, unclear technology, and fluid participation. The authors assert that the American college or university does not know what it is doing, its technology is familiar but not understood, and both faculty and students "wander in and out of the organization." As a consequence, it is difficult "to describe, understand, and lead." The two major phenomena which are said to justify this description of the college or university enterprise are the decision-making process and the process by which attention of the participants is directed toward or away from the organization itself.

Cohen and March set forth eight different types of governance and leadership characteristic of social institutions. These models are found to be implicit in the professional literature about organizations and administration. These models are described under the designations: (1) the competitive market metaphor, (2) the administrative metaphor, (3) the collective bargaining metaphor, (4) the democratic metaphor, (5) the consensus metaphor, (6) the anarchy metaphor, (7) the independent judiciary metaphor, and (8) the plebiscitary autocracy metaphor. The authors report that they would expect most presidents to accept some mix of the administrative metaphor and the democratic metaphor as a realistic definition of their role. The authors assert that their anarchy metaphor requires only two conditions: acceptance of an ideology of anarchy and an effective information system for all participants in the organization. They argue that less conventional understanding of the presidential role drawn from less familiar metaphors will enhance rather than diminish the effectiveness of presidential leadership. In one of the findings of their study Cohen and March report that student leaders appeared to believe that presidents should intervene in the processes of a college or university on behalf of their values. They were critical about the time spent in fund-raising and in cultivating external constituencies. Students rejected the legitimacy of boards of trustees and of various constituency groups. They judged the college or university president by the extent to which his moral perspective was that held by students themselves.

Cohen and March conclude that the college or university president faces "four fundamental ambiguities": these are the ambiguities of purpose, power,

experience, and success. The authors acknowledge that the president probably has more potential for moving a college in a particular direction than any one other person, but they see this potential as nonetheless quite limited. The authors conclude that presidents frequently fail to understand the anarchy of the structure over which they preside, are confused by the ambiguities they confront, tend to exaggerate the consequences which may follow from the role they undertake. In the end they offer eight rules: spend time, persist, exchange status for substance, facilitate participation by the opposition, overload the system with projects and choices, separate problem discussion from project discussion, manage unobtrusively, and interpret history.

Cohen and March have provided students and practitioners of higher education with the most comprehensive study of the college and university president ever prepared in this country. Utilizing concepts and techniques drawn from the behavioral sciences, the authors have endeavored to present an objective, realistic appraisal of the organizational entity labelled a college or university and of the role of the president within this academic community. Many persons may be bothered by the technical jargon of the authors and so fail to perceive the substance of the observations. The tone of the comments may be interpreted at first reading as hostile to presidents; I consider these comments to be equally if not more critical of faculty members and students. It is interesting to note that the authors studied in some detail the careers of 42 college and university presidents who are identified by name, but apart from analyzing their time commitments, the authors have said very little about their actual administrative styles. Cohen and March have been more concerned to construct a concept of the presidency in a college or university decision-making context.

I believe two requirements are essential to the proper exercise of administrative authority: widespread consultation and effective communication. Presidents and their associates must listen carefully to the various interest groups within the academic community, and to the extent deemed reasonable and consistent with basic purposes, to accommodate these interests. To this end, consultative bodies of all kinds—councils, senates, and committees—should be given access to all desired information, provided with all available choices, and afforded an opportunity to express their points of view. Furthermore, because the consultative machinery is at its best representative, communication of problems and decisions, with the reasons for them, must reach all individuals who make up the academic community. These individuals may be only partially interested, and they may not hear or read the communication addressed to them. But the effort at communication remains indispensable.

Some administrators as well as some faculty members and some students may find the machinery of governance today time consuming and even disillusioning. There is ever a disposition in society for some members to want to "escape from freedom." But participation is the order of the day in the academic community, and until attitudes substantially change widespread participation must be practiced, whatever the cost. One cost may be that participation and consultation will delay timely action, action needed to handle a crisis situation which demands resolution today rather than tomorrow. Financial deficits constitute such a crisis just as much as do the destruction of property and the injury of

persons. Under these circumstances immediate action is imperative. In the past, administrators were expected to act in these crisis situations. Now they are expected to share their authority. One hopes that the necessary actions can still be taken in time.

Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that administrators in an academic community should originate policy proposals. The nature of their work, especially their planning obligations, suggests that they will be heavily involved in formulating desirable objectives and the means for their accomplishment. The most important role of administrative authority—this expression of the common good of a college or university—is seldom given the attention it deserves. If an academic community could define its common good, and if its constituents could generally subscribe to that definition, then administrative authority would be more widely acceptable. The task that challenges administrators is therefore to define and articulate this common good—in terms acceptable inside the academic community as well as externally. Perhaps it is impossible to find any such common good. If this is so, then administrative authority will remain forever suspect, forever on the defensive. But to my mind, the best mechanism for gaining consensus about the common good is through administrative participation in an institution-wide academic community council.

COMMUNITY COUNCIL

The basic problem of governance, in a polity and in an academic community, is how to accord to constituent groups their appropriate role in decision-making. There are many constituent groups within the academic community who have interests to protect and to advance. Faculty members have power by virtue of their highly specialized, highly technical kind of knowledge, and tend to accept evaluation of this knowledge only by peers within their discipline or profession itself. Students have the power of withdrawal and nonenrollment, as is so evident today. Staff members have the power of slowdown and strike. Administrators have the power of delegated authority. How are these relationships of power to be recognized and accorded legitimacy in the structure of governance of a college of university?

A new governing mechanism, separate from the lay governing board but sharing some of the authority vested by law in the lay board, may be the answer. In several instances the terms *academic community council* and *community consultative council* designate this new device in colleges and universities. It seems to me that such terms are more appropriate than the labels *senate*, *assembly*, or similar words. The use of the phrase *community council* suggests both the need for common commitment among all the interest groups of a college or university and also a body for resolving conflicts among these interests. The addition of the word *academic* seems appropriate as a clear indication that the community involved is one of academic interests.

The major organizational questions involved in such a device are those of its representational base and the delineation of its role. Insofar as representation is

concerned, the problems are those of constituencies to be represented, numbers of representatives, and method of selection. In some instances, faculty members and students have wanted a council which excluded staff representatives and administrators. Any such attitude is an indication of political immaturity and a guarantee of organizational failure. At a minimum, the constituent groups within an academic community are faculty, students, staff, and administrators (managers). The distribution of representation must obviously recognize these different constituencies or "estates." Otherwise, if representation is based upon the principle of "one man-one vote," the representation may be determined entirely by student votes. The numerical representation from within these constituencies is also troublesome. In a college, faculty members will usually desire some distribution of representation among disciplines; in a university they will usually prefer representation by colleges. Students may desire representation distributed among levels (lower division, upper division, graduate), among housing units, among fields of academic interest, and among men and women and ethnic groups. Staff members may seek distribution among white collar, blue collar, and professional groupings. Administrators may want a distribution among academic managers, academic support managers, student support managers, and institutional support managers. As a consequence, the relative distribution may be difficult to resolve and the numbers involved in a constituent academic community council may be sizeable.

Selection of representatives may be made either directly or indirectly. In the one instance, each constituency may be the voting unit, although administrators probably should serve *ex officio* rather than being elected by the administrative group. In the other instance, representatives may be selected by an intermediate unit, such as a faculty senate, a student senate, a staff senate, or similar bodies. If it is desirable to preserve separate bodies such as a faculty senate, student senate, and staff senate, than an academic community council which brings together representation of these bodies seems highly useful.

Insofar as role is concerned, the assignment of function to an academic community council should be that of college or university legislation. Whatever it is proper and appropriate for the college or university to embody in the form of ordinances, rules and regulations, or resolutions of campus-wide applicability, then the academic community council should have the authority to resolve the issue prior to consideration by the lay governing board. It is important that the role of the council be understood as that of governance, not management, as policy determination, not policy performance. Issues of strategy in the execution of policy are just as much a legislative concern as issues of policy objectives. The framework of academic organization and the allocation of available financial resource are proper legislative concerns equally with determinations of desired outputs of the academic enterprise. The limitation upon the legislative authority of a college or university community council can be relatively simple: that of enacting legislation of institution-wide applicability.

In this discussion of constituent groups of the academic community to be involved in the community council, I have omitted any mention of alumni. This omission is not intended to suggest that alumni are unimportant or are not members of the college or university community. On the contrary, I think

alumni are an extremely important element of an academic community. I have not included alumni representation here because I think alumni can best be represented in the process of governance by participating in the selection of members of the lay governing board and by serving on this board. Because of this participation in the lay governing board, it does not seem necessary or even desirable for alumni to be represented on the community council, although they may be asked to serve on certain of its advisory committees.

To be sure, some may argue that the only agency of governance needed in a college or university is the lay governing board. An academic community council in addition to a governing board will appear to such persons as an unnecessary device for meddling and delay and as a means for wasting time better devoted to scholarship and study. These are not idle criticisms, but two possible responses can be made on the basis of theory and practice. In theory, higher education brings faculty, students, and managers together in a unique social relationship which is an environment of learning; and so unique a relationship warrants unique arrangements for governance. Indeed, if the academic community is to exemplify self-governance, it must in fact possess the mechanisms for self-government. In practice, if an academic community council does not demonstrate that the academic community is competent to be self-governing, nothing seems more certain than more extensive government by governmental agencies outside the college or university. Cowley (1967 and 1969) has made it clear that faculty members have not been notably successful in their attempts at self-government, and proposals such as that of Dominguez (1973) that trustees should reign rather than rule presuppose the capacity of an academic community for self-government. A community council as a structure of governance may assist this endeavor. Only experience can demonstrate the consequences of such structure.

3 Governance of Systems

Governance within a particular college or university, within a particular campus, is by no means the only organizational arrangement now involved in the governance of higher education. The origins of higher education systems go back at least to the early days of this century, and their importance is growing. State governments and public universities have developed systems in response to the great expansion of enrollment and other demands placed upon state-sponsored and state-supported higher education, and even a few private colleges and universities have established branch or satellite campuses.

State systems of higher education are essentially of two kinds: the multicampus state university and the state-wide coordination of all institutions under a state board of higher education. The two arrangements are quite different, and thus it is possible at the same time (as in California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Texas, and Ohio, among others) to have both multicampus universities and a state board of higher education. But in some states (as in Florida, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Utah, Hawaii, and Alaska), the multicampus university is a single system governed by a single state-wide governing board.

Multicampus systems have various characteristics. Lee and Bowen (1971) in their study for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education devoted their attention to "multi-campus universities" rather than to multicampus systems. They used four criteria in identifying eleven such systems: (1) the university had authority for only a portion of higher education in a state; (2) the university included more than one senior (four-year) campus; (3) the system executive had the title of president or chancellor; and (4) the system executive was not simultaneously the chief administrative officer for one of the campuses. I would add another defining characteristic for a multicampus system as well as for a multicampus university: the existence of a single governing board having the authority of government for two or more campuses. Omitting multicampus community or junior college systems, of which there are now a considerable number, at least

fifty-one multicampus university systems appear in the 1972-1973 higher education directory; and if universities with branch campuses offering less than a baccalaureate program were included the number would be even larger. Some of these multicampus systems have considerable student enrollment: in 1972, that of California State University and Colleges system was over 300,000; of the State University of New York, over 360,000; of the City University of New York, over 225,000; and of the University of Wisconsin system, over 130,000.

State boards of higher education have a role somewhat different from that of the governing board of a multicampus university (except, of course, where the two boards are one and the same). As an administrative agency of state government, they serve the governor and legislature primarily as a professional adviser about legislation desirable for the operation of higher education. In many instances they have by law only one or two responsibilities for which they exercise authority at their own discretion. They approve the offering of new degree programs and the establishment of any new branch campus of state-supported colleges or universities. Otherwise, they may make studies of the state's educational needs, prepare a master plan setting forth the objectives of state policy affecting higher education, recommend to the governor and general assembly legislation designed to carry out the master plan, and review the appropriation requests and recommend the necessary appropriations for state-supported institutions of higher education.

Both the multicampus system and the state board of higher education involve new levels of governance for colleges and universities. The authority for governance of a campus in a multicampus system is a shared authority, distributed between the local campus and a central office concerned not with any one campus but with the system as a whole. The state board of higher education provides state governors and legislators with continuing and informed review over the activities of state-supported higher education. In both arrangements, the individual campus finds that local autonomy has been brought under scrutiny by and accountability to another authority.

Undoubtedly individual campuses in a multicampus system and individual colleges and universities in a state-wide system are restive because of the existence of a superior governance structure. Individual campuses and individual universities wish to decide for themselves what instructional programs to offer, what other educational activities to undertake, what students to admit, how large to become, what support requirements they need. But these kinds of decisions made by an individual campus or by an individual university may duplicate or overlap decisions made by other campuses and universities. And these kinds of decisions can only be implemented if the necessary financial support is provided by the system and by state government. Multicampus systems have found that campus autonomy may create support needs which exceed available financing, and state governments have found that institutional autonomy presents financial claims which the state is not prepared to fulfill.

Even where state constitutions have conferred some special constitutional status upon one or more state universities, this status is no guarantee that the state universities will not be brought under some degree of state government supervision. In their study of the experience of state universities in four states

with constitutional status as contrasted with the experience of state universities in four other states with legal status, Glenny and Daglesh (1973) found that all state universities were now subject to intensive review of their programs and their budgets. The major protection of autonomy for a campus and for a state university remains not status but self-restraint.

MULTICAMPUS SYSTEMS

Lee and Bowen (1971) provide extensive data about the governance of multicampus systems, despite their restrictive attention to a few "university" systems. The problems they consider are probably representative of the problems of any multicampus system.

In reviewing the history of the nine multicampus universities they studied, Lee and Bowen found that the economy, politics, and traditions of the states where these universities are located had more to do with the development of multicampuses than any ideas about governing structures or processes. Some state universities have expanded from a single campus to several campuses as a protective device. In some instances the original state university was located in a small city, apart from the state's major urban centers. As college enrollment advanced and as population became increasingly urbanized, the state university had either to reach out into unserved major urban areas or let the state legislature create new state universities. The multicampus state university was an effort to keep educational planning in the hands of state university governing boards rather than relinquish it to the governor, the legislature, or some other state agency. In other cases, the state university has brought its prestige and influence into various geographical areas of the state because representation in the state legislature is organized on a geographical basis. Expansion of the state university to a number of campuses has been politically advantageous, since it provided the university with a broader base of legislators directly interested in its appropriation fate.

As Lee and Bowen point out, some multicampus state universities have developed not from the aggressive effort of the state university but from the desire of struggling state colleges or other institutions to tie their fate to the state university. In New York the state university system was in large part the brainchild of an active governor, as Carmichael (1955) makes clear. And even complications about the appropriate location of a medical school or a college of agriculture have had their part in encouraging multicampus state universities.

It seems evident from Lee and Bowen that none of the multicampus university systems they examined has been able to resolve two major problems: one is the distribution of authority between the central office of the system and the individual campus; the other is the effective participation of faculty members and students in the central governance of the system. Perhaps there is no way to resolve these two problems satisfactorily. Just as campus administrators are more concerned with the well-being of their campus than of the entire system, so faculty members and students identify more closely with a campus

than with a system. It is one thing to give a central executive and a central governing board responsibility for broad planning and coordinating activity for the system as a whole. It is quite another for one board governing all the different campuses to make final decisions about governance and management. And few administrators or governing boards have ever designed a process that clearly differentiates issues for local determination from issues requiring central determination.

It is not unusual for a central executive and governing board to refuse to resolve problems peculiar to a single campus or to arbitrate a dispute between competing groups on a single campus. These safeguards are essential; without them, much of the time of the administration and board would be spent in adjudicating local conflicts and the authority of the local administration would be substantially undermined. But these safeguards also serve to discourage faculty and student interest in the work of the central administrators and board members; they are perceived as indifferent to or remote from faculty and student concerns.

Lee and Bowen (1971, pp. 416-419) find certain strengths as well as shortcomings in the multicampus university systems. These systems have tended to strengthen new campuses, especially in faculty recruiting; promote specialization, diversity, and cooperation among campuses; impose quality control on new graduate programs; realize some efficiencies in business management and gain some political advantage by their single-administrator approach to the state governor and legislature. Among their shortcomings, Lee and Bowen list the absence of a stable agreement on the relative roles of state government, state board of higher education, and university system; inadequate state government delegation of fiscal authority to the system; inadequate budget preparation by the system; too little encouragement of innovation; the failure of the single governing board to consider its unique role in relation to individual campuses; and the failure of the system to serve as an effective buffer against political pressures from state government.

These generalizations may reflect Lee's and Bowen's long-time association with the state of California and may not be equally applicable to other states. I would add to them certain observations about the multicampus system as a system of governance. It seems to me that the problem of governance for the multicampus university system is essentially internal to the system itself and centers in the distribution of authority between local campuses and system headquarters. Local influences arising from the communities where campuses are situated impinge upon the activities of each campus. If there is a principal campus in the system, it will try to exert, through the central office, control over the instructional programs, the faculty recruiting, and other operations of the other campuses. Presumably the central office will endeavor to see the interests and needs of the system as a system and will treat all parts equitably in accordance with some master plan of system development.

The heart of the difficulty of multicampus governance stems from the fact that the central governing board and administration have little contact with faculty, students, and others on the individual campuses or with their local communities. yet at the same time, they feel obligated to exercise authority by

attending to considerable detail affecting each local campus.

In his foreword to the Lee and Bowen study, Clark Kerr observes that, because the lay board of a multicampus system is farther removed from the local atmosphere of a single campus, the board is "more likely to react ideologically to problems" and more likely to be concerned with the reaction of state government than with that of the academic community. A single event on a single campus may thus provoke a political reaction that affects the entire system, especially since the single governing board is supposed to be "governing" every campus. If the objective of a structure of governance is an interaction between competing interests—the lay governing board representing the social interest, and the faculty, students, administration, and other groups each representing their own interests—I believe the multicampus concept is deficient, particularly where a campus in a large metropolitan area becomes the satellite of a "flagship" campus in another city. Even where the multicampus system can be most useful —where satellite campuses have a limited role, in communities under 500,000 population—the flagship campus will tend to resist responses of the satellites to local community needs. Much must be done to achieve real decentralization of governance within such multicampus systems.

The multicampus governing board has a choice of tactics here. One is to delegate a maximum authority of governance to each campus, even by associating a local community lay board with the local campus structure of governance. In these circumstances the multicampus board reserves the bare minimum of governing authority to itself: appointing the presidents of local campuses, authorizing the introduction of new programs, and approving budgets. In these circumstances, the governing board may on occasion invite consultation with local faculty, student, and staff groups but avoid a continuing and structured relationship with them. The other choice for the multicampus lay board is to exercise a substantial range of governing and managerial authority. When it does so, some kind of continuing and structured relationship with faculty, students, and staff is not only advisable, it is indispensable.

If recent legislation in Utah, Wisconsin, North Carolina, and Maine is the harbinger of future actions, the single multicampus state university embracing all the state's public higher education except its community college system may become a trend. But as a governance structure, the multicampus system overemphasizes the authority of the lay governing board and the central administration office. It is thus likely to be more popular with governors and legislators than with faculty, students, or local administrators.

STATE BOARDS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Among those states where a single governing board of a multicampus system does not have authority for all public higher education except possibly the community colleges, most have found it desirable and necessary to create a state board of higher education as a separate and distinct agency of state government. The authority vested in these state boards varies from state to state, but in

general the authority is that of planning how best to meet state needs in higher education and of advising governors and legislators what policies and appropriations to enact. The effectiveness of this planning and advisory activity depends in large part upon the kind of personal relationships which develop between the state boards and governors and legislators.

In Section 1202 of the Education Amendments of 1972 the federal government directed every state government to establish commissions of postsecondary education "broadly representative" of the public interest and of the institutional interests of state colleges and universities, private colleges and universities, community colleges, vocational and technical institutions, and proprietary schools. These commissions were required if state governments were to participate in certain grant programs authorized by the federal legislation. In many states the state boards of higher education may not qualify as these commissions for postsecondary education because their membership will be deemed not to be sufficiently "representative" of the various enumerated interests. Some conflict between the state boards and the state commissions thus becomes possible. Since the federal government has seen fit only in 1974 to fund the administrative costs of these state commissions on a limited scale and since no funding of the programs for which their advice is a necessary prerequisite has thus far been provided, the future of these postsecondary commissions is uncertain. The potential for conflict between state boards of higher education and these commissions is high.

The movement toward state boards of higher education has been well reported by Glenny (1959) and Berdahl (1971). Three developments in state public higher education during the late 1950s and the 1960s made these state boards more or less inevitable. One was that public higher education became more important than ever before as a concern of state government. Public higher education expanded rapidly in enrollment, in campus locations, and in instructional programs; higher education appeared to be important to economic growth; and when campus disruptions and other student disorders began in the 1960s, state governments were alarmed by the lack of law and order on public campuses. Second, higher education began to cost more; higher faculty salaries, new instructional programs, and new campuses cost money, and university presidents, sometimes in competition with each other, sought ever-increasing state appropriations from governors and legislators. Third, a former voluntary coordination among public colleges and universities disintegrated as dominant presidents passed from the scene, institutional rivalries became more pronounced, and traditional division of assignments among different institutions broke down.

Under these circumstances, governors and legislators sought new arrangements for their relationships with state colleges and universities. One possibility was to strengthen the state budget office or finance department; another that appeared in two states was an executive department of education; but the major precedent for a new governmental arrangement was the state board of education that had existed in many states for decades. If a state board of education was the appropriate device for handling state government relationships with local school districts, why not a state board of higher education for handling relationships

with state colleges and universities? Indeed, in some states the existing board of education became the state board of higher education also; but in some twenty-five others, the board of higher education became a separate and distinct agency.

In 1973 a task force on coordination, governance, and structure of higher education set up by the Education Commission of the States issued a report asserting the importance of state-wide planning and coordination of public higher education. Under the chairmanship of Governor Scott of North Carolina, the task force pointed out the primary role of the states in determining public higher education policy in this country. The task force recommended no single pattern of governance or coordination for the states; rather it accepted the proposition that each state must determine its higher education structure according to its own needs and interests. At the same time the task force emphasized the importance of state-wide planning and urged that a state agency in the higher education field should be the primary, comprehensive, and objective source of information and recommendations for consideration by the executive and legislative branches of state government.

A balanced view of the state university and the state board of higher education was provided by the Carnegie Commission in its 1971 report, entitled *The Capitol and The Campus.* It expressed concern about the "growing dominance of governors" over higher education in several of the states and also about the development of "heavy-handed regulatory councils over higher education." It recognized two functions which needed to be performed by state coordinating agencies–long-range planning and consultation within higher education–but criticized their performance of "routine administrative tasks, bureaucratic controls, and detailed regulation."

From my own experience, I have come to believe, first, that a state board of higher education in each state is essential for the welfare of higher education. Second, I think a state board of higher education should be a planning and coordinating agency as the Carnegie Commission suggests rather than a state-wide governing board, since there is a need for lay influence in every major public university. Third, I believe that the state board of higher education should be separate from the state board of education. Fourth, its authority should not extend to institutional managment. Fifth, it is essential that the state board's chief executive officer should be a person of stature, experience, and competence in the field of higher education. Finally, although faculty members and students have on occasion argued that they should have representation on the state board, and although avenues of communication are desirable between the board and faculty and student groups, I believe such representation may promote a lack of confidence on the part of governors and legislators in the board. The political interests of faculty and student groups will be best advanced not by such representation but rather by effective behavior as special interest groups with sophisticated techniques of lobbying.

Glenny (1973) has recently called attention to a number of trends that, he argues, point directly to the need for greater centralization of planning at the state level. These trends include a drop in the national birth rate and a drop in the actual number of college-age youth after 1978; the fall in the proportion of all males eighteen and nineteen years of age enrolled in college from forty-four

percent to thirty-eight percent in 1972; the apparant stablization of the proportion of all females eighteen and nineteen years of age enrolled in college at thirty-four percent; lower enrollments in four-year colleges and universities in 1972 than in 1971; and the declining proportion of state government budgets devoted to higher education in a number of states. Another factor might be added: the prospect that, except in the health professions, two-year technical education fields and engineering, colleges and universities may be graduating more students than the labor market is prepared to absorb in positions commensurate with their educational achievement.

It seems clear that the scope of the instructional programs and the desirable levels of enrollment in state colleges and universities must be carefully reexamined. So also should the place of private institutions in helping to provide educational opportunity and to meet society's needs for educated talent. Each state must work out some kind of acceptable financial relationship between the public and private sectors of higher education. The problem of access for minority and lower-income groups remains troublesome. The geographical distribution of facilities and programs also requires further attention.

These major planning concerns for the 1970s and 1980s cannot be left solely to the efforts of individual colleges and universities. They must be addressed on both a state-by-state basis and a national basis. The state role in such planning falls squarely in the hands of the state board of higher education. Decisions will be made primarily through the legislative process, with, one hopes, the advice of the state board.

State government financing of higher education will also be a major problem during the 1970s and 1980s. As enrollment slows, stabilizes, or even declines, new procedures for calculating expenditure requirements will be needed. Some incremental increases in costs will be justified, I believe, in addition to the increases resulting from inflation. Some increases may be needed also in order to improve the quality of instructional programs. And justifiable expansions in research and public service may continue.

I am convinced that state boards should exercise authority in two fields: long-range planning and budgeting. If the budget authority is to be assumed by state government budget offices, there is no need to duplicate it within a state board of higher education. I prefer to see this activity performed by the state board of higher education because of the unique circumstances and financial choices confronting higher education.

The authority of governance vested in individual institutions is restricted to the extent that state governments undertake to implement long-range master plans and to the extent that state governments must make financial decisions affecting the operation of both public and private institutions. This seems to me a necessary situation. Colleges and universities are touched with a public interest and depend upon public support. As a consequence, their governance must operate within the constraints of that public interest as defined by state and national governments and within the constraints of that public support those governments supply. By the nature of their services and their financing, colleges and universities have no other choice.

4 Management

Above all else, a college or university is an enterprise to perform work, often several different kinds of work. It is not a debating society, a voluntary association to advance special personal and professional interests, a legislative assembly for enacting public policy, or an executive agency to administer these policies. It is not a church to preserve and transmit a religious faith and dogma or to evangelize new communicants. A college or university is an enterprise to educate students, to encourage intellectual advancement and artistic creativity, to promote educational justice, to serve society as a storehouse of intellectual competencies, technological ideas, and cultural resources, and to promote the self-renewal of society through reason and intellectual persuasion. A college or university has work to do.

Management is the business of getting work done. Management is work performance. It is appropriate, as I have suggested elsewhere (1967), that the activities of an enterprise be thought of primarily in terms of operations and administration. Operations involve the performance of the assigned tasks of an enterprise. Administration involves techniques of work direction and management of resources available for work performance. In this present discussion I prefer to employ the neutral term *management* to encompass both administrative activities, work direction and resource management, because the term *administration* has a certain connotation pertaining to a particular group of people in a college or university.

In most of the recent discussions about governance very little has been said about management. I fear that much of this argument has created the impression that higher education is far more interested in debate than it is in work performance. It is high time to reverse an unfortunate public image, especially if colleges and universities want continued public support.

It is worthy of note, for example, that in its report on governance (1973a), the Carnegie Commission said nothing at all about management or work per-

formance. Rather, in identifying "six priority problems" of governance, the Carnegie Commission spoke of campus autonomy, collective bargaining as an alternative to faculty participation in governance, academic tenure, the role of lay governing boards and of presidents, and the necessity for some arrangement for emergency decision-making. Some of these problems were issues of process, and some were issues of substance—as in the instance of policy concerning academic tenure—but none was concerned with work processes and work management.

The two tasks of management are work direction and resource utilization. The techniques of work direction are well known, although they have been variously described by management experts. They include budgeting, organizing, communication, coordination, reporting, and control (evaluation). Resource utilization includes accounting, staffing, constructing and operating physical facilities, obtaining and using equipment, obtaining and using supplies, transporting persons and things to work sites or other points of work activity, and providing communication facilities and services. Colleges and universities have certain special management activities to perform: to house and feed students; sometimes to house faculty and staff members; to provide social and recreational facilities and programs, health services, and cultural services; and to protect life and property. In the larger society outside the college or university, these "auxiliary services" are provided by various enterprises: proprietary, professional, voluntary, and governmental. Traditionally, however, colleges and universities have thought of themselves as self-contained social communities with an obligation to provide not just a place of work but also a place of residence, partly because the towns in which so many colleges and universities were located were not prepared to offer or to finance the residential and other auxiliary needs of an academic community.

I do not intend here to imply any sharp and fixed line of demarcation between governance and management. I identify management separately only in order to make clear that colleges and universities are in the production business. They produce certain defined outputs. These outputs are accomplished by work, including work direction and resource management. No great policy decisions about purpose and objectives can be made without appropriate concern for work processes, work direction, and resource management. This fact would seem to be self-evident; yet the constraints of technology, financing, and management appear to be overlooked in so many discussions of higher education governance. Faculty, students, administrators, and others have asked basic questions about governance, but they have often failed to ask basic questions about management. Participants in the enterprise have demanded that they govern but then have preferred to ignore their role in work performance and management. This imbalance remains to be corrected.

If we grant that the various participants in the enterprise of higher education should govern the enterprise, we must then inquire into the competence of these same participants as managers. The structure of governance is not necessarily the appropriate structure of management. Even more importantly, the structure of governance should not result in decreased effectiveness and efficiency of work performance if the public is to be asked to continue its support of higher

education. Public concern with management effectiveness and efficiency has been demonstrated in various ways in recent years. Various state legislatures, as in Michigan and New York, have attempted to specify the hours of work faculty members in state institutions should devote to instructional activity per week. In 1971, the Ohio General Assembly mandated a managemant improvement program in each state-supported college and university under the general guidance of the Ohio Board of Regents, the state board of higher education.

Further evidence of public concern is found in the policy statement by the Committee for Economic Development (1973) on *The Management and Financing of Colleges*. The statement indicates that the occasion for its issuance was the increasingly precarious financial outlook for American colleges and universities as of 1971. This financial condition had been caused by a slowdown in enrollment growth and by a continued rapid increase in costs, increases which exceeded the general rate of inflation. In these circumstances, the CED proposed that planning should concentrate upon consolidation and the improvement of management. In order to promote management improvement, the CED urged every college and university to establish a policy committee, distribute managerial responsibility together with an equivalent and explicit distribution of managerial authority, use modern techniques of planning, explore new techniques and processes of instruction and interinstitutional cooperation, and establish appropriate procedures of due process in order to guarantee equity and justice in all matters pertaining to faculty, students, and staff.

It is clearly evident that management improvement is a major public expectation. The public will assess changes in governance by the contribution these changes make to improved management: to work direction and the utilization of available resources.

ACADEMIC MANAGEMENT

No operation of a college or university is in need of greater attention in terms of improved management than is instruction. The CED declared (1973, p. 49) that "the principal source of possible savings is in instruction." It pointed to the possibilities of fewer small classes, new instructional technology, instructional experimentation, nontraditional education, and the development of techniques for evaluating teaching excellence, and it suggested modifications in salary practices to reward teaching, the strengthening of faculty preparation for undergraduate instruction, and more effective faculty career development programs.

Some faculty members, however, resist the proposition that there is a management dimension to their work, prefering to think of themselves as individual professional practitioners. In an era when faculty members have found it desirable or necessary to specialize in the knowledge they learn and impart, these faculty members continue to practice their instructional role as if their own field of knowledge was the entire substance of man's learning which it is desirable for a student to master. Instructional objectives, procedures, and evaluation all remain largely determined by individual faculty members.

Authority for academic management is traditionally described as a hierarchy involving department chairmen, college deans, academic vice-presidents, and presidents, with final decision-making authority vested in the governing board. Alongside this management structure is a hierarchy of faculty bodies from departmental committees to institution-wide committees, faculty senates and senate committees. Sometimes this faculty structure exercises the authority of both governance and management, perhaps because for many faculty members there is no perceived difference between the two. Another factor may simply be that faculty members are more inclined to recognize the legitimacy of the structure for governance than for management. Actually, in practice, there tends to be no hierarchy of academic or faculty management in many colleges and universities. Management decision-making begins at the departmental level and proceeds upward rather than the reverse, which is the usual definition of hierarchy. The instructional product, the research product, and the public service product are highly individualized outputs, and the need for any management coordination to achieve a common product is not often recognized.

The president and academic vice-president may think that they have been delegated management authority in academic matters from the governing board; but in practice, faculty members consider that they themselves should decide issues of academic process. Such academic issues usually arise at the level of the academic department and may be reviewed at the level of the college or the university. Insofar as some faculty members are concerned, the important academic issues should arise only at the departmental level; institution-wide committees should be simply devices for review rather than points of initiation; and the reviews had better be favorable or the status of departments is threatened. "Live and let live" is the prevailing philosophy in most phases of academic management among departments, despite sometimes fierce competition among them for students and resources.

The management problem in organizing departments by specialized fields of knowledge is that these specializations exist in considerable isolation, while degree programs presume a certain common association of departments in pursuit of a defined objective. This problem is probably more acute in the arts and sciences than in the various professional fields, because at the undergraduate level these disciplines are supposed to be involved in general or liberal education. In fact, while departmental organization of the academic disciplines recognizes the specialization of scholarship, it does not recognize the program objectives of either general education or liberal education. Undergraduate colleges have failed to develop, sustain, or execute programs of general and liberal education in large part because of a failure in management: undergraduate education in the arts and sciences is essentially education in disparate disciplines, with such distribution among disciplines as may be fixed by the purely mechanical device of course credit requirements. Almost all colleges profess a commitment to the objectives of general and liberal education. In practice, these commitments are seldom more than a declaration of pious purpose with a minimum of specification of a work output.

This failure may be ascribed in part to the absence of a clear-cut definition of the faculty role in the management of general and liberal education. At the

departmental level faculty members are hired to instruct students in their own field of academic sub-specialization, and almost no effort is made by the department to construct a coherent pattern of undergraduate education in other disciplines. At the level of the college, the academic disciplines as represented by academic departments prove themselves unable to resolve issues which they were unable to resolve at the departmental level. Since course offerings are usually determined by faculty members on a collegial basis in departmental meetings and in faculty meetings, the failure appears to be the collective failure of the faculty to plan and execute an instruction program on a collective basis.

In these circumstances, the roles of deans and of academic vice-presidents become somewhat uncertain. Clearly important activities may be attached to the dean's office—in agriculture, for example, an agricultural experiment station and an agricultural extension service; in education, a laboratory school; in medicine, a teaching hospital; and in all cases, management authority over the secretarial, travel, equipment, and supply support provided to instructional departments. But in general, the dean or vice-president is expected to support departments to the fullest extent possible and confirm departmental decisions that are subject to review rather than to challenge departmental positions. As the practice of peer and student evaluation of faculty performance increases in our colleges and universities, the emphasis is upon the performance of the individual faculty member in the individual classroom, as the study of Miller (1972) clearly indicates. Very little attention has been given to faculty performance in its collective role, at the departmental, college, or university level. Faculty performance continues to mean primarily instructional, not management performance.

Certain obvious tasks are required of academic management—specifically, work direction and resource management—and there is no adamant disagreement within colleges or universities about the importance of these tasks. Disagreement does exist, however, over who should exercise management authority. Departments want maximum management authority vested at the departmental level, some faculty want it at the level of the individual faculty member, and administrators believe it should be exercised at a broader level.

Yet in reality, major decisions about planning, programing, organizing, and evaluating instruction; about staffing; and about the use of equipment and supplies are typically made at the departmental level. Some colleges and universities have experimented with new departmental arrangements to overcome program deficiencies at the undergraduate level. One has been to separate graduate departments from undergraduate departments; a second has been to abolish departmental specialization at the undergraduate level and to recognize only divisional specialization in the humanities, the social and behavioral sciences, the biological sciences, the physical sciences, or mathematics; and a third has been to superimpose a management structure for general education and for liberal education upon the departmental structure. All three instances have involved an effort to restrict the faculty role in management and to strengthen the role of a program manager. The issues were clearly presented fifteen years ago by Litchfield (1959) and were reviewed more recently by Moran (1968). Yet I think we may take it for granted that most colleges and universities will continue to be dominated by instructional departments; and because there is little likeli-

hood that faculty participation in governance will strengthen the management authority of deans and other administrators, the one major management technique available to academic managers will probably remain the academic budget.

ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES

The management of academic support services is quite different from the management of instructional services. The most important of these support services is the library or learning resources center, as it is now designated in some institutions, but other services include admissions, registration, audio-visual aids, the computer center, specialized research facilities, project grant support, museums, performing arts facilities, and broadcasting facilities.

Academic support services are typically managed on an institution-wide basis in order to ensure their proper professionalization, full utilization, and equitable availability to everyone in the institution. Ordinarily, these services are each headed by a professional director who is supervised by the academic dean or vice-president. A considerable part of a dean's or vice-president's management authority is thus directed to ensuring their satisfactory operation.

Instructional departments are naturally anxious whether or not a disproportionate part of the total instructional budget is being devoted to these academic support services rather than to faculty salaries and direct departmental support such as secretarial assistance, travel, and equipment. But management authority over these services by the dean or academic vice-president is generally unquestioned. Faculty committees may have some advisory role in library management, admissions management, course scheduling management, and the operation of other services, but typically they operate as policy-making or governmental bodies to specify objectives and oversee operations or as liaison to provide maximum department-by-department accomodation and communication.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Most colleges and universities provide two kinds of services to students: those that support the student in his role as learner and others that support the student in his role as person. The first category includes academic counseling, developmental or remedial instruction, cultural enrichment through the performing arts, financial assistance (including student employment), and job placement. The second category includes personal counseling, housing, dining facilities, health care, social activities, recreation, and even child care—an emerging student expectation. The learning-oriented support services are required on both the residential and commuting campus; in fact, they are especially important on commuter campuses that practice open admissions. In

contrast, personal support services have generally been considered essential only on residential campuses.

I am somewhat uncertain about how to identify the program of intercollegiate athletics. Is it an academic service to a few students interested in careers as professional athletes or as professional coaches? Is it a student support service in the form of entertainment? Is it a public relations activity or a community service? I suspect that to some extent intercollegiate athletics takes on aspects of all these endeavors. At least one university president has declared that after the student disruptions of 1969-1970 nothing did more to reunite the campus in 1970-1971 than a championship football team.

The management of these services has usually been the unquestioned responsibility of the administration. In most institutions, presidents have found it desirable to delegate their management to an administrative associate as dean of students or as vice-president of student affairs. Student-faculty committees have generally only made suggestions about management to program managers. Since 1968, however, both faculty and students have evidenced considerable interest in managing these services—in major part, I believe, because of a concern with the cost of these services and a desire on the part of some faculty and students to see substantial cuts made in these costs. Since these services are generally financed at least in part by compulsory student fees, students may increasingly prefer a curtailment of services and a corresponding reduction in fees.

There are, again, two quite separate issues involved here: governance and management. The scope, magnitude, and financing of student support services are issues of governance, while the planning, programing, and performance of these student support services are issues of management. As long as colleges and universities continue to offer these services, the services must be entrusted to professionals who are competent to render the services effectively and efficiently, and the authority of management for these services must be vested ultimately in the chief administrative officer. I have heard of only one instance in which as an aftermath of the governance crisis of 1968-1969 a university vested the authority of both governance and management for student support services in the university senate, with management authority to be exercised by a committee of faculty and students. I shall be very surprised if this management arrangement long survives.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

There is yet another range of services that appropriately falls into the realm of institutional support management. Sometimes referred to as "business" operations, they include the management of nonacademic personnel, the purchase and distribution of supplies and equipment, plant construction and maintenance, the operation of student residences and dining facilities, insurance protection, transportation and communication, printing and duplicating, internal security, the collection of accounts, the disbursement of funds, accounting for

all income and disbursements, and the investment of endowment and reserve funds. Every one of these services is indispensable to the operation of a college or university.

A major development of the past fifty years has been the professionalization of these institutional support services under the direction of men and women with special qualifications of education and experience to manage them effectively and efficiently. Various manuals of desirable operating practice for these services have been published, such as *College and University Business Administration* (American Council on Education, 1968; National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1974) and those by the National Association of College and University Business Officers on planning, budgeting, and accounting (1970a) and on student record keeping (1970b).

The management authority for institutional support services has generally been vested in the president, who directs them usually through a vice-president for business affairs or a vice-president for operations. The indispensability of these services, the need for a management authority for their provision, and the location of this authority in the president have gone unchallenged in recent debates about academic governance.

Some students and faculty members have demanded a voice in investment management in order to curtail endowment commitments to businesses or nations which are alleged to be involved in racial discrimination, imperialism, and environmental pollution, in the belief that policy formation on these subjects must be followed up with direct approval of every proposed investment. There has also been some argument about campus security, with demands that campus police be disarmed, that security forces be reduced in size, that police be better trained in handling students, that the scope of security activity be reduced, or that institutional security service be terminated and the city police provide the same protective service on campus as elsewhere.

It is perhaps unfortunate that discussions about governance have given so little attention to the management of these institutional support services. Their importance and their continued operation on an effective and efficient basis should not be taken for granted. Faculty and students may tend to ignore the need for these services, until a salary check goes unpaid or a meal goes unserved; but no governance structure is complete which does not provide for the proper performance of these institutional support services.

INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT

Finally, the area of enterprise performance which I label "institutional management" involves the exercise of all techniques of direction institution-wide, including planning, programing, financing and budgeting, organizing, coordinating, communicating, reporting, and evaluating. There are also the techniques of leadership and for that reason I shall discuss most of these processes in the next chapter. But one facet of institutional management deserves attention here: that of emergency management.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973a) called attention to this subject of emergency or "unprogramed decision-making" because of the numerous instances of campus disruption in recent years. It asserted that in a time of crisis a college or university must take appropriate action to ensure its survival, and that in effect, the authority of crisis management should be vested in the president. An effective system of governance should provide the guidelines for crisis management, including a prescribed procedure for handling emergency situations, provision for administrative consultation with a designated group of faculty members or others, and authority for action in such a situation assigned to the president. Many colleges and universities have found it difficult to spell out specific procedures, but the need for crisis management cannot be ignored. Whether or not such guidelines have been established, the president must serve as both leader and manager to make sure that the institution is not destroyed by violence or individuals harmed by inadequate response to emergencies.

5 Leadership

In all the discussions of governance for colleges and universities in recent years, no problem has been more troublesome than that of leadership. In an annual report as president of the Carnegie Corporation, John W. Gardner once expressed his concern that the decade of the 1960s was witnessing a generation of students who had been inoculated with an "anti-leadership vaccine." Some faculty members and students have believed that organized arrangements for academic leadership are no longer needed and that only the spontaneous and shifting leadership of the moment is necessary in a college or university. Thoughtful business executives like Besse (1973) and others reported by the Management Division of the Academy for Educational Development (1972) sense differences in attitude toward leadership and management authority as a major difference in the effectiveness of business enterprise in contrast with academic enterprise. Other observers such as Holmer (1973) and Glenny (1973) have complained about the absence or anonymity of campus leadership.

Leadership is an organized arrangement for linking governance and management – for linking decision-making and work performance. Any structure of governance that does not provide for leadership in decision-making and in work performance is deficient. More than this, such a structure of governance will be self-defeating, guaranteeing for itself fruitless debate, frustration of effort, and failure to govern.

Although leadership begins with a structured role, it is personal in that it requires specific personal characteristics. It is customary to identify these attributes as education, experience, judgment, integrity, skill, health, stamina, thoughtfulness for others, and decisiveness. Perhaps more than any other characteristic, however, leadership is the capacity to motivate others toward a common objective and to join individual talents in a common activity. Leadership involves the utilization of techniques of direction in the governance and management of an enterprise. These techniques include planning, programing, finance and

budgeting, concern for legal authority, communication of shared purpose in order to achieve a shared understanding, coordination of the specialized capabilities of persons and processes to ensure desired output, reporting of accomplishment, and evaluation of performance. Confusion about how these techniques are to be employed, and who is to direct their employment, has led higher education officials to wonder if these techniques constitute a "promise or a dilemma," as the volume edited by Millard and others (1972) indicated.

Leadership requires collective competence. As scholarship and professional practice have become more specialized, so leadership of an academic enterprise has required an aggregation of specialized competencies. No one person can today expect to be competent in all the techniques of direction, or equally competent in the management of the various components of the enterprise, from academic management through institutional support management. The individual who is formally designated as a leader must associate himself with a variety of competencies, both professional and managerial. Some persons have said that leadership has now been placed in committee and express concern about the resulting sacrifice of decisiveness in leadership. But competence in judgment is essential to decisiveness if leadership is to be effective and acceptable.

Leadership involves response to changing circumstances. That ours is a changing society is a common cliché. The dimensions of change have been explored by such authors as Drucker (1969), Brzezinski (1970), Kahn and Bruce-Briggs (1972), and Bell (1973). The implications of social change for leadership in various kinds of enterprises have been suggested by Cleveland (1972) and the Conference Board (1973). In colleges and universities, as in other enterprises, leadership confronts various challenges, from a changing technology to changing attitudes of people. It may well be, as Gardner (1970) argues, that institutions and social systems do not move until they are pushed. And he insists that if the push is not administered by "vigorous and purposeful leaders," change will be administered by an aroused citizenry or by a crisis.

Leadership demands responsibility and accountability. It has long been argued that the social cohesion needed in any society or group rests upon the legitimacy of authority and upon the legitimacy of the leadership of that authority. But leadership requires more than legitimacy; it requires acceptability. Barnard pointed out many years ago (1938) that executives must be concerned that their directives are acceptable to the persons to whom they are addressed if those directives are to be obeyed. There is more to leadership, moreover, than acceptability. The responsibility of leadership is at least three-dimensional: professional, legal or governmental, and moral. Professional responsibility is the obligation inherent in professional competence and in the public trust accorded to professional competence. Legal or governmental responsibility is the formal arrangement by which leaders are selected and replaced. Moral responsibility is the obligation of a leader to consider always the welfare and dignity of his or her fellows. Leadership also involved the much-used term, *accountability* – that is, responsibility for results and the expectation that an enterprise and its leadership will produce the outputs they profess to be their objectives.

Leadership leads to effective and efficient production. Engineers have long

understood efficiency as the ratio of output to input. Thus, efficiency is closely related to productivity. Effectiveness has to do with the achievement of desired objectives by a particular strategy, a particular technique. Is the particular objective sought realizable by the particular strategy employed? Can the same or approximately the same objective be achieved by other strategies? Thus cost-effectiveness compares alternative strategies for achieving the same or similar objectives in terms of the cost in dollars. Leadership in an enterprise is expected to know the effectiveness and the efficiency of an enterprise, and to be concerned constantly about the reasonable prospects of increasing both conditions.

Finally, leadership involves sanctions. Not every member of an enterprise will necessarily accept its leadership arrangements or its existing leadership. Sometimes this nonacceptance will be passive or almost indifferent. On occasion it may evidence itself in vigorous criticism or various forms of determined hostility; it may precipitate a struggle for power or a change in leadership or in the agency of leadership; or it may lead to acts of sabotage, disruption, and violence. In these circumstances, it is not unusual for leaders to employ sanctions whereby criticism is muted or hostility eliminated. In the past, the sanctions of a reduction in compensation or dismissal from employment were the usual means for handling criticism and hostility, and on rare occasions other reactions might occur. Today, these usual sanctions are not generally acceptable and may even be unconstitutional or illegal. There is no choice for college and university leadership except the sanction of reason. I do not mean that acts of disruption and of violence against person or property must be ignored or must go unpunished. These acts must be handled by due process of law. But in the academic community the only appropriate response to criticism is reason.

PRESIDENTS

Throughout most of their history American colleges and universities have sought and found their "natural" leaders in the person of their presidents. The history of higher education in this country is studded with the names of presidents distinguished for their unique contributions to an institution and often to higher education as a whole: names like Charles W. Eliot, Andrew D. White, Daniel Coit Gilman, James B. Angell, G. Stanley Hall, David Starr Jordan, Charles R. Van Hise, Benjamin Ide Wheeler, James H. Kirkland, William Rainey Harper, Nicholas Murray Butler, John H. Finley, Arthur T. Hadley, Ethelbert D. Warfield, William Trufant Foster, Frank Aydelotte, Arthur E. Morgan. The impetus for educational development during three centuries was the college or university president like these.

The age of scholarship since 1940 has been different. The role of the college or university president has undergone a subtle but nonetheless real transition, as numerous presidents have testified. For example, Wriston (1959), in his reflections about his presidency at Lawrence College and then at Brown University, has noted that his relations with the faculty at Brown were quite different from

those he enjoyed at Lawrence. The explanation was size and specialization. Wriston saw the only hope for a vigorous department at Brown as a vigorous department chairman; the president's role was limited primarily to affording faculty members the maximum possible opportunity for their teaching and research.

Stoke (1959) saw the role of the president changing from that of academic innovator to that of academic manager. The growth in enrollment, instructional programs, noninstructional activities, buildings, and costs were combining to force the president into the role of a manager of services with little opportunity for educational innovation. The problems that people brought to the president involved complaints, requests, and permissions, but seldom educational ideas; and emphasis upon the need for the president to find the financial resources required for the operation of a college or university precluded much opportunity for careful thought about education. Stoke saw that the role of the president as manager and the role of the faculty as scholars needed to exist in harmony with a minimum of conflict; but he sensed that the campus was uneasy because a conflict in relationships between faculty and administration was brewing.

Dodds (1962) was even more emphatic in presenting his concern about the wide gap between the potential and the reality of the presidential role. Indeed, he presented the dilemma in the title of his volume: *The Academic President–Educator or Caretaker?* Dodds argued that the prime function of the president should be to serve as an educational leader. He said that the job specifications for the position called for a combination of talents for educational leadership and managerial competence, but that events of the postwar years had tended to emphasize the managerial duties above those of educational leadership. He pointed to the complex organizational needs of the modern university campus, to the public duties of the university president, and to the requirements of campus ceremonials. But above all other factors, Dodds recognized the "schizoid nature" of colleges and universities as the central demand upon the president's time, thought, and energy. The university, he wrote (p.13), "displays a sort of split personality," with a constant internal tug of war between the demands of faculty individuality and the institutional need for order, between the demands of social nonconformity and conformity. Dodds gave full recognition to the managerial aspects of the president's role, and emphasized consultation as a major administrative skill. At the same time, he declared that he had found very little evidence to suggest that university faculties had given systematic thought to the needed scope and structure of university leadership. Dodds was certain that this leadership should come from the president, but he recognized that it depended upon faculty confidence and trustee support.

It remained for Kerr (1963) to point out that the uses of the university had extended so far in terms of the multiplicity of its services, its role as a federal grant agency, and its enrollment growth that the president was now a mediator rather than a force for educational response to changing needs. He observed that the intellectual world of the university had been fractionalized, that faculty government had become cumbersome, that faculty members were now full participants in a knowledge society. He was hopeful that the "multiversity" had

not lost its capacity to be a "city of intellect," to adapt to new circumstances, and to serve useful social purposes; but he recognized the realities which had given the university president a reduced role in the leadership of this new kind of educational enterprise.

In a sense, Perkins (1966) continued the representation of the landscape painted by Kerr. Writing three years after Kerr and two years after the outbreak of student disorder at Berkeley, Perkins recognized that while the university had become central to the conduct of national life, it might well become the victim of its own success. At the same time that students were clamoring to enroll, other students were expressing violent displeasure with college and university policies. At the same time that research was being supported ever more richly, research was being attacked as destructive of instruction, or of society itself. At the same time that professions sought more influential roles in society, professional education was becoming more and more highly specialized, less and less humane. Perkins had two primary concerns: the university might lose its unique identity and it might lose its capacity to manage its own affairs. Management, Perkins declared, involved deciding what it was good to do, what it was wise to do, what it was timely to do, and what it was possible to do. He noted the faculty inability to govern; the faculty wanted maximum permissiveness to each individual faculty member and maximum protection in the exercise of this permissiveness. Perkins saw university leadership as the task of the president, assisted by fellow administrators, a few faculty members with an institutional point of view, and a few students with a concern for the welfare of the university. He saw the combination of institutional management and educational leadership as the joining together that made academic administration a unique and vital business.

More recently, Bennis, (1973a; 1973b), has raised again the question whether or not a university will permit a president to lead. He has pointed out the continuing concern of faculty members with their own specialized interests and with noninterference from other faculty members, administrators, or the larger public. Students have seemed less inclined to disruption but at the same time less interested in their educational experience. The general public outside the university—the media of mass communications, the leaders of various social groups, the opinion-makers—seemed to be more concerned with the trivia of academic management than with far-reaching issues of purposes and process. Could and would the university president somewhere in the internal maze of blind alleys and in the external haze of limited perspectives somehow find the strength and the support to lead the university in the resolution of its problems? Bennis was hopeful, but not entirely assured, about the prospects.

It is clear that thoughtful presidents such as these share two or three basic points of view. One of these is that a college or university today confronts fundamental issues of purpose, objectives, strategies, resources, and organization that are not easy to resolve because of the competition of internal groups for attention and self-advancement and because of the attitude of external groups which provide the support necessary for the academic enterprise. Second, there is no hope for resolution of these issues without leadership. And third, because of the nature of the presidency as a link between internal constitutents, the lay

governing board, and external sources of interest and support, this leadership can be supplied only by the university president.

I see no other instrument or agency of the college or university to whom to look for leadership or from whom to expect leadership than the president. I think there may be several desirable changes in the practice whereby presidents are selected; the methods described by Bolman (1965) and Pattillo (1973), among others, will require more extensive participation and more careful restraint than in the past. And the exercise of leadership will require certain protections not considered essential in the past. But the task of leadership remains. The role of leadership cannot be abandoned in any enterprise, especially in a college or university, with any hope that the enterprise can survive as a viable, effective, and efficient undertaking.

LEADERSHIP FOR THE FUTURE

I think we may safely assume that the decades of the 1970s and 1980s will be different for higher education from the decades of the 1950s and 1960s. Enrollment growth is slowing down. Research activities will stabilize in volume and be more closely oriented toward specific national needs. Instructional objectives and techniques must be adapted to a wider range of student abilities and cultural backgrounds. Income growth will become more difficult to sustain. Under these circumstances the need for effective leadership will become more essential, more indispensable than ever before. That leadership will continue to be centered in the president. But it will be a different kind of leadership. The days are gone when a university president could make decisions and expect them to be generally accepted. The new academic leadership will involve extensive consultation, communication, and information.

Presidents and their administrative associates will have to spend a great deal more time than in the past in the process of consultation. Whatever the structure of participation by which faculty members and students are involved in the decision-making process, the consultative process has "arrived" in American higher education, and academic leadership must accommodate its style to this new process.

Communication within and among the interest groups of higher education will be equally demanding. The new decision-making process will be a process of representation: representation of faculty, students, alumni, the general public. But representation will not be enough. Communication, not just with representatives of various constituencies but with their entire membership, is necessary. Constituencies will no doubt receive information from their representatives directly, but this will not be sufficient. Leadership will have to communicate its point of view directly to all persons in the enterprise. Frank, open, and detailed communication is surely the order of the day.

The strategy of academic leadership in the future will be, above all, an information strategy. Leadership in the 1970s and 1980s will depend in substantial degree upon a comprehensive management information system

structured on a program basis, including instructional, research, and public service programs and academic support, student support, and institutional support programs. Accurate data about the outputs and the cost of each such program will be indispensable. At the same time, information about input costs will continue to be required: such inputs as personal service costs, supply and equipment costs, plant costs, and other costs. But input costs must be related to the costs of desired outputs, and priorities will have to be established among desired outputs. Planning and budgeting will depend upon information. This information can be generated only by managers—program managers and others—and can be brought together in a meaningful whole only by academic leaders. Data gathering and analysis hold the key to academic decision-making.

Academic leadership must also be based upon an adequate and sound program of income development. As mentioned earlier, of some thirty billion dollars expended by institutions of higher education in the fiscal year 1973-1974, it appears that about 55 percent of the required income to meet these expenditures was derived from governments (state, federal, and local), 4 percent from philanthropy (endowment income and current giving), and 41 percent from prices to consumers. Within these totals were many variations in the particular experience of some 2600 colleges and universities located on some 2900 separate campuses. The income for the future expenditure patterns of these institutions and campuses will be drawn from these same sources, perhaps in different proportions one to another.

The new participation of faculty and students in the decision-making process carries with it the obligation to participate in income planning and income development. It will not be enough just to indicate needs; the programs to be undertaken will have to be financed as well. A concern with desirable levels of expenditure cannot be divorced from a concern with available sources of income and their magnitude. Yet, the leadership role of lay governing boards, of presidents, and of the administrative associates of presidents in this and other areas has been under attack, and the objective of restructuring in fact often has been to restrict the fiscal authority of boards and administrators. Little consideration seems to have been given to possibilities of alternative leadership structures, and even less attention has been directed toward the whole problem of a leadership linkage between governance and management.

It seems to me that the essence of governance is leadership, is a structuring of a leadership role. It is all well and good to talk about democracy, participation, and involvement, but without an arrangement for leadership most social groupings remain ineffective and short-lived. Many young people may think an unstructured, spontaneous, changing leadership pattern is desirable within social groupings, but it remains to be shown that any such arrangement can achieve desired outputs and desired continuity. Moreover, leadership in governance must be linked to leadership in management. The two roles are highly interrelated and mutually supportive, as parliamentary systems for the joint exercise of legislative and administrative leadership in liberal democracies illustrate.

The pressing structural issue in college and university leadership involves finding an arrangement to accommodate leadership based upon board appointment with leadership based upon faculty and student acceptance. Various adjustments

in organizational structure have been instituted or advocated in recent years to resolve this issue. Presidents have been appointed by governing boards only after extensive consultation with faculty representatives, student representatives, staff representatives, and alumni representatives. In effect, these representatives in concert or singly have exercised a *liberum* veto over presidential appointments to the point where there is some concern whether or not only a person of bland personality and few ideas can survive this selection process. Presidents have associated with their leadership activity a wide assortment of consultative arrangements, and have devoted so many hours to listening to others that they have had small time to think for themselves. Some faculty and student senates and community councils have insisted that presidents defend all their recommendations with these groups before presenting them to the governing board.

Interestingly enough, while proposals have been made that presidents be elected by a joint vote of students, faculty, and staff rather than appointed by the governing board, I have heard of no instance in which such a proposal has been implemented.

There does appear to be growing interest in a periodic review of presidential leadership as advocated by President Brewster of Yale University. It may well be that five-year terms of appointment, subject to renewal after review, will become fairly common for presidents in the future. Any such practice surely implies the need for a college or university to provide for the professional security of a president at the conclusion of his or her term of office; this can be done by the guarantee of a faculty position. Otherwise, academic leadership may well fall into the hands of persons who are nearing the end of their academic lives.

It appears also that there is a growing practice for academic administrators (academic vice-presidents, deans, department chairmen, librarians, registrars, admissions directors, and others), student support administrators, and institutional support administrators to be appointed by presidents only after extensive consultation with various groups. In this way, efforts have been made to find leaders who can combine acceptability to constituent groups with managerial competence. The long term consequences of this consultative practice are still to be observed.

When new senates or community councils have been established on various campuses in recent years, the question of whether or not to make the president the presiding officer has been troublesome. There are two or three possibilities. One is to consider the president as just an ordinary member, no different from others. I think this practice is destructive of the whole idea of leadership. Another is to have the president serve as chairman of the council. I think this is a preferable arrangement to the first, since it recognizes the leadership role of the president and gives him or her a highly visible status; but there is a possible disadvantage in the expectation that the presiding officer shall preside rather than participate in the discussion. A third possibility also deserves attention: the election of an impartial presiding officer and the vesting of some control over the agenda and the conduct of debate in the president.

It is clearly evident from recent academic history in the United States that the structure of leadership is undergoing change. The idea that an enterprise can

function effectively and efficiently without leadership is an expression of deep-seated faculty commitments to individuality and of deep-seated student hostility to authority. Yet the need for leadership remains. The need for linkage between governance and management remains. The mechanisms for effective leadership in both governance and management are still to be achieved.

6 Alternatives of Choice

The fact is clear that changes are taking place in the structure of academic leadership and governance. It would be helpful if there were available an extensive and intensive evaluation of the experience to date with these changes. Mortimer (1971) has reviewed some of the structural arrangements, as have others cited by him, and Jenks (1973a, 1973b) has offered a fairly extensive account of the considerations involved in developing and approving a new structure of governance at the University of New Hampshire. But these accounts are descriptive rather than evaluative.

It is evident by this time, however, that there are certain common issues to be resolved in any examination of the structure of leadership and governance within a college or university. Certainly we are a long way from arriving at any organizational "best practice," and it is unlikely that any college or university which has installed new organizational arrangements in recent years is prepared to assert that it has solved all its problems and has arrived at some stage of near-perfection in both process and output. Yet it does seem possible to identify most, if not all, of the troublesome issues and to suggest some of the alternative choices available for adoption. We shall look at these in the remaining pages of this discussion.

PURPOSES

Governance has correctly been seen as a means to desired ends, and the basic conflict has involved the ends to be desired. For this reason any discussion of governance must begin with a concern for purposes. These issues need to be

clearly identified. Few if any persons can afford to be content with the well-known couplet of Alexander Pope:

> For forms of government let fools contest
> Whate'er is best administered is best.

In fact, there are two kinds of purposes to be resolved in a discussion of governance. The basic kind of purpose is the primary mission or goals which a college or university seeks to accomplish. The statement of fivefold purposes offered by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973b) and summarized in Chapter One is a useful starting point for any effort to draft a definition of institutional purpose to be incorporated in a formalized ordinance or charter of government such as that illustrated at the end of this chapter. In some circumstances it may be desirable to go beyond a brief declaration of purposes and state certain fundamental objectives and policies of the college or university. In this way basic guidelines are established at the very outset of the operation of the structure, and while it is probably wishful thinking to expect that this effort will completely prevent any subsequent conflict about purposes and policies, it will help make these purposes and policies clear to members of the institution and its governing bodies.

A draft statement of purpose and program policies appears at the end of this chapter. The original statement from which this text is adapted was prepared by a faculty-student-administration committee at a public university, and the statement is probably equally applicable to a private university. Obviously a statement of purpose for a general baccalaureate college would be somewhat different. But any such statement provides a definite framework within which the structure of decision-making is expected to operate. The second kind of purpose involves the reasons why an instrument of government is desirable or necessary within a college or university. Such a statement is often set forth in a preamble to the instrument or ordinance of government. As higher education moves toward more formalized practices, and "procedural regularization," as Ikenberry (1971) has termed the tendency, the utility of such an instrument of government becomes evident. Courts of law have long asserted that the preambles of the federal and state constitutions are not substantive provisions of constitutional prescription, and undoubtedly the preamble of a college or university ordinance of government is not a statement of law; it is rather an explanation of intent. But as an explanation a preamble is of major importance and a guideline for governmental practice.

GOVERNING BOARDS

There are several issues to be resolved in reviewing the composition and role of lay governing boards. Tactically, it must be remembered that in public colleges and universities, the composition of a board of trustees can be changed only by state law, or in some cases only by amendment of the state constitution. In private colleges and universities, any change in composition of the board of

trustees may require amendment of the charter granted by the state government or of the by-laws filed with the state government. These changes are not simple, and for this reason among others few changes in the formal composition or the legal authority of boards of trustees have been made in recent years.

The most discussed proposal for change has been that of adding faculty and student members to boards of trustees. Several individuals and groups have recommended against such action, including the Assembly on University Goals and Governance (1971) and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973), and I find their arguments persuasive. The abandonment of the idea of the lay governing board for public institutions would only mean the encouragement of an expanded authority for state boards of higher education and of state government in higher education affairs.

A different kind of proposal has involved broadening the composition of governing boards to include more young persons, women, blacks, faculty members or professional staff members in other institutions, and nonprofessional workers. These proposals seem to me to have merit, although it must be recognized that all persons are not equally situated economically or socially to contribute unpaid services or to assist in advancing the social resources of a college or university.

In the case of most public colleges and universities, trustees are generally appointed by the governor of a state, or, when a local unit of government is involved, by the local executive authority. In several recent instances, governors have voluntarily made use of an informal nominating machinery of faculty, students, and administrators; and a formal nominating procedure has been specified by a constitutional amendment in Colorado. This practice is probably desirable. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973) has argued that governors and legislators ought not to be members of governing boards; this position seems to be sound. The same exclusion might well apply to the state superintendent of public instruction. In some states there is a procedure whereby some trustees of a state university are elected by alumni rather than appointed by the governor. My own position is that all trustees of a public university ought to be appointed by the governor, but I would hope that a good number of these trustees would in fact be alumni. When alumni are elected through an alumni association, there is the possibility that those selected will not be as representative of the public at large as is desirable for a public university.

In the case of most private colleges and universities, boards of trustees tend to be self-perpetuating, electing their own successors. A minority of board members may be elected by the alumni; this practice seems desirable in a private institution. But in the near future, privately sponsored colleges and universities receiving state government financial support will need to ask themselves about the implication of government support for their practices in the selection of trustees. McConnell (1971b) has already asked this question, and others will surely do so as state government funding is increasingly sought for private colleges and universities. I think private colleges and universities obtaining public funds and especially state government funds for instructional support would be well advised voluntarily to request state governors to nominate some persons for election as members by the board itself.

There are also questions about the size and the length of service desirable on a board of trustees. It seems likely that the most commonly employed size for the board of a public college or university is nine members, while the most commonly employed size for the board of a private college or university may be in the twenties or thirties. There may well not be any one ideal size. I have listened to vigorous arguments in defense of from nine to fifteen for public boards, and from twenty-four to thirty-six for private boards. I am disposed to accept nine as a useful size for a public board and twenty-four or twenty-seven as a useful size for a private board. On the matter of length of service, I think some limitation is highly desirable. Two terms of six years each seems to me to be a reasonable period of maximum service.

As far as the role of the governing board is concerned, the principal matter of discussion seems to be the delegation of extensive legislative authority to an academic community council or other entity within the institution. In the past, as we have noted, many governing boards have delegated authority over curricular and degree requirments and student conduct to a faculty senate. But the president could bring such recommendations as he saw fit to the attention of the board, whether they had passed the faculty senate or simply originated in his office. The development of an academic community council has created a new question whether all recommendations for consideration by the board of trustees should have to clear through the council. The president might still present routine matters to the board unilaterally for its action, but should any matter of major policy importance be expected to have been considered first by the academic community council? In this new relationship between council and board there arises the issues of what weight shall be given to council action and whether the academic community council should be the major avenue of institutional communication with the board rather than the president.

Any legislation of the community council might be considered merely advisory to the governing board, but this arrangement would require that the lay board not take action without prior action of the council. Another possible arrangement is for any legislation of the academic community council to be automatically binding on the institution unless the president declares that it involves an issue of major public or institutional interest so important that the legislation must be reviewed and approved by the board before being implemented.

Regardless of any of these arrangements, there are at least four areas of concern over which it seems to me the board must retain authority. One is the appointment and reappointment of the president. A second is the adoption of a budget for both current operations and capital improvements. A third is the adoption of an ordinance for crisis management. The fourth is its inherent or retained authority to ensure the survival of the enterprise. On all of these matters the governing board may and should ask for advice from an academic community council, but there should not be any doubt that on these issues the authority of the governing board is primary and complete.

It has often been suggested that governing boards should establish committees on which faculty and students have membership. I do not agree with this suggestion. I believe it is preferable to follow the procedure of city councils, state

legislatures, and the United States Congress in having committee meetings open to hear testimony from faculty members, students, professional staff, administrators, and other interested persons. There should be an opportunity for direct communication between any person or group in an academic community and the governing board, but this communication can be handled by committee hearings; it is not necessarily dependent upon faculty and student membership on board committees. At the same time, a governing board may, when it believes the arrangement to be desirable, ask faculty leaders and student leaders to meet with the board or with board committees on an informal basis for discussion of important institutional issues.

It is essential to emphasize that the lay governing board in both public and private institutions should perform the indispensable task of providing linkage between the institution and society. On the one hand, this linkage must preserve a reasonable degree of autonomy for the institution, and on the other it must insist that the enterprise adapt itself to changing social needs. When this linkage breaks down, one of two results may be expected. The institution may survive but lose a large part of its autonomy, or the institution may lose a large part of its support and be unable to survive.

I have not been concerned here about state government or even federal government administrative machinery to plan and to coordinate the activities of colleges and universities. Both arrangements are critical, and becoming more so as the expectations for social support of higher education expand. At the state government level, there are three choices for administrative machinery: an executive department of education, a state board of higher education, and a state-wide governing board for all public colleges and universities. I prefer the second arrangement because a board is generally acceptable in educational organization and because a state board should have restricted rather than unrestricted authority over individual institutions and campuses.

The problem of restructuring university governance has also arisen in Canada. As early as 1962 the then-designated National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges endorsed a recommendation from the Canadian Association of University Teachers to undertake a study of university government. The result was a report by Duff and Berdahl (1965), reviewing the issues involved and setting forth general guidelines for future change. The Duff-Berdahl report acknowledged the existence of a good deal of tension in Canadian universities between faculties, administration, and boards of governors. The report recommended that boards of governors be retained, that faculty members be added, that boards and university senates work more closely together, that senate duties be more clearly defined, and that presidents see their role largely in terms of consultation with senate committees and communication between senates and boards.

The Duff-Berdahl report was followed by the establishment at the University of Toronto of a commission on the government of the university which submitted a report in 1970. The Toronto report asserted that the problem of university government was to accommodate a variety of interests. The need therefore was to formulate certain "principles of community" acceptable to a substantial majority of university members and conducive to the survival of the

university. These principles included common participation of faculty and students in learning, common participation in a structure of governance, and common acceptance of policies decided by the structure of governance. There followed proposals for a variety of faculty-student committees, culminating in a new governing council of sixty-six members which would combine the existing university senate and board of governors. Of the sixty-six members, ten would be appointed by the provincial government, ten would be elected by the alumni, twenty would be elected by the student body, twenty would be elected by the faculty, and six would be administrators (the president and five assoicates designated by the president).

The province of Ontario responded to the commission report by enacting a new University of Toronto Act in 1971. The law created a new governing council of fifty members, sixteen appointed by the provincial government, twelve elected by the faculty, eight elected by the students, eight elected by the alumni, two elected by the support staff, two appointed by the president, with the president and chancellor to serve *ex officio*. This new governing council began to operate in 1972.

COMMUNITY COUNCILS

In most discussions of a new structure of governance for a college or university, the central issue has been the authority and composition of a community council. In general, the authority of such a council has been defined in terms of determining policy or legislation for the institution. Certain exceptions are almost always recognized and specified; the most common have been questions involving the operating budget, the capital improvement budget, and endowment and investment policies. In some instances there has been an attempt to spell out in some detail the scope of this legislative authority; in one instance it has been defined to include policies and activities having important social or political implications such as programs for minority groups and the disadvantaged, admissions policies, student financial aid, the relations of the university to the local community, public safety, and military training, in addition to the general matters of instruction, research, and public service. One instrument of government even provides that this legislative authority does *not* extend to the content of the course instruction or research of an individual faculty member or to the "personal" views or actions of any member of the university community related to any social or political issue.

Another much-debated concern has involved the actual effect of duly determined legislation. Is this legislation binding upon all constituent groups of the academic community, or is it simply advisory to these groups? Should legislation be subject to veto by the president and the board of trustees or by either one? Should legislation which is disapproved by the president be subject to an overriding vote? Should legislation which is disapproved by a governing board be subject to an overriding vote? These and similar questions have aroused a good deal of argument within colleges and universities.

Several choices are available in responding to these questions. Since the legislative authority of an academic community council is delegated to it by the governing board, the board must decide whether or not the delegation is complete. The governing board may decide to review all legislation and to give its approval or disapproval. Presumably, a governing board would be guided in this review by the recommendation of the president. I have grave doubts about the wisdom of delegation of the authority of veto to the president by a lay governing board. It seems to me that the authority of veto must and should remain with the lay governing board. On the other hand, there is a choice between board reviews of all legislation or board review of only such legislation as a president may request the board to review. The task of reviewing all legislation can be burdensome to a governing board, but I believe this practice is preferable to selective review. In fact, board review may well be routine in most instances; it will be more than routine only where there has been substantial controversy and a strong division of opinion about the resolution of some issues. There is no need for a president to call special attention to these matters of substantial controversy; the very controversy itself will surely alert a governing board to the existence of differing positions on a matter. The board will then necessarily have to arbitrate the conflict. The fact that a governing board reviews all legislation will serve as a reminder that this process of review does exist. Selective intervention by a governing board will tend to make the board a party to the conflict rather than a kind of impartial arbitrator.

When legislation originating in and enacted by an academic community council is reviewed and approved by a governing board, then that legislation obviously should be binding upon the academic community. There should be no question about its applicability. Moreover, this legislation becomes an obligation of administrators to implement and to enforce. It sets the guidelines and the standards for the conduct of all college or university programs and activities. Such legislation is, of course, subject to repeal, amendment, or modification at any time, but otherwise it is binding upon all members of the community and the failure to abide by the behavioral requirements of the legislation is a cause for some form of punitive action. The one restriction upon the scope of such legislation is that it may not repeal or modify any of the provisions of the ordinance of government itself.

The composition of the academic community council raises several difficult issues. What constituent groups of the college or university community shall be recognized in the membership of the council? I have previously expressed my opinion that the desirable answer to this question should include faculty members, students, administrators, professional staff, and operating staff. But there are questions about size and about the basis of representation. It appears that if all constituent groups and interests within a university are to be represented in a community council, the membership will be sizeable. Councils of seventy-five to one hundred members are not uncommon in a university where there are several instructional colleges, an enrollment of ten thousand or more students, a faculty of seven hundred or more persons, a professional staff of one hundred or more, and an operating staff of five hundred or more.

There is, of course, a troublesome issue in the matter of defining the

membership within these various groups. One question is whether to include only full-time faculty members, full-time students, and full-time staff members. My own definite opinion is that part-time personnel giving as much as one-half of their time to college or university activities should be included as participating members of the academic community. It is desirable and necessary to provide in the instrument of government for some definition of the persons who shall be considered members of the constituent groupings. These definitions are certain to involve some difficult choices. It is probably time, however, for colleges and universities to confront the necessity for having these definitions.

Another set of questions involves the relationship among constituent groups. In many community councils there is provision for an equal number of faculty members and students, with a lesser number of persons representing the professional and operating staff. Administrators are defined by the title of the position held and usually include the president, the academic vice-president, the other vice-presidents, and the academic deans. In some instances academic deans are included as faculty members, but I believe their presence within an academic community council is highly desirable and that they should serve *ex officio* rather than by the chance of election. On the other hand, it seems to me that department chairmen should be considered faculty members. In one instance I have found a provision that 45 percent of the membership of a community council was reserved for faculty members, another 45 percent for students, and 10 percent for all other members. This seems to be somewhat overrepresentative of faculty and underrepresentative of staff. But if faculty representation is reduced, faculty members will usually insist that student representation also be reduced. Faculty members tend to be much concerned about the possibility that students will be placed in a position of governance over the faculty of a college or university.

There is a further concern about representation in the distribution of faculty members among colleges, and the distribution of students among fields of study and among levels of study (undergraduate, graduate, and graduate professional). In some faculties there is conflict between the faculty of arts and sciences and the faculties of professional schools. In one instance I have found a provision that the faculty representation in the community council should not include more than 50 percent drawn from the faculty of arts and sciences. In a college or university with graduate enrollment, there is usually a special provision for graduate students within the student representation.

Finally, there are troublesome issues about the relationships of faculty and student members of a community council to continuing bodies of faculty and student governance. The primary question is whether, after an academic community council has been established, the need for organs of faculty and student government continues. This is not an easy question to resolve. In two instances, I have encountered a situation where, at the time of structuring new arrangements of government, the faculty senate and the student senate were abolished. In both instances, after four years of experience there was a considerable sentiment on each campus which held that the elimination of these bodies had been a mistake. There was a belief that these bodies should be reestablished in order to give attention to faculty concerns in which students were not involved and to student

concerns in which faculty members were not involved.

On the other hand, where a faculty senate and a student senate continue to exist, there is a very real possibility of conflict or duplication between these bodies and the community council. Moreover, in matters of legislation, as distinct from matters of management, all issues are matters in which there is a mutual faculty and student interest. I shall comment later about faculty and student roles in management. But where legislation is involved, a separation of faculty from student interest seems undesirable.

Among the arrangements which I have encountered or have learned about, the one devised at the University of New Hampshire and described by Jenks (1973a) is the most imaginative. This arrangement recognizes the need for a faculty caucus and a student caucus, but each entity is composed of the faculty membership and the student membership in the university senate. There is apparently growing sentiment at the University of New Hampshire in favor of strengthening the authority of these two caucus groups; this sentiment probably reflects disillusionment or anxiety about faculty collaboration with students and student collaboration with faculty. Such distrust is bound to occur, but I wonder if the best interest of the academic community will be served by this *apartheid*-like policy.

With a sizeable membership in an academic community council there must be an arrangement for specialization of attention or for distribution of the work load through a committee structure. At a minimum an academic community will need committees on planning, budget, instruction, faculty affairs, student affairs, and institutional affairs. There must also be an arrangement for leadership, and this should be provided through an executive committee to be discussed later.

The presiding officer or chairman of the academic community should be elected by the council but should *not* be a leader of the council. The appropriate model for this presiding officer ought to be the Speaker of the House of Commons in the United Kingdom. The president of the college or university should be chairman of the executive committee and exercise the role of leadership for the entire academic community in this position.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING VERSUS ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

In the discussion up to this point little has been said about faculty collective bargaining within a college or university. This omission has been deliberate for a simple reason: some uncertainty about the future direction of collective bargaining agreements and about the possibility that these agreements may become the essential instrument of faculty-management relationships in higher education.

At the outset of these comments I would make one personal observation. In my judgment, faculty collective bargaining and faculty participation in academic governance are incompatible. I know there will be many who will not share this point of view. And experience with collective bargaining

agreements is too recent for anyone to have yet undertaken an empirical analysis of this hypothesis. I would express another personal observation. It seems to me that collective bargaining as a procedure strengthens rather than weakens the position of Administration within the academic enterprise.

In their study of collective bargaining in higher education, Carr and VanEyck (1973) acknowledged considerable uncertainty about the impact of faculty collective bargaining upon academic governance. They reported speculation ranging from the belief that collective bargaining would destroy a shared authority of governance to the belief that collective bargaining would give the faculty a stronger role in governance. Carr and VanEyck did conclude that collective bargaining would increase the authority and influence of governing boards. They seem to imply that the faculty role in a college or university may be exercised primarily through collective bargaining or primarily through community governance but not through both mechanisms. The authors say only that presidents have an uneasy role in the bargaining process. They do not speculate about the possibility that administrators may have a more positive role in academic management in the process of contract enforcement.

In its discussion of collective bargaining as a "priority problem" of higher education governance, the Carnegie Commission (1973a) recommended that faculties in each institution should undertake a "most careful analysis" of the implications of collective bargaining as an alternative form of academic governance. The Commission further recommended that collective bargaining agreements should cover economic benefits and not academic affairs. I view these recommendations as in effect an acknowledgment of the possible incompatibility of collective bargaining and community governance.

In its 1972 state-wide plan for the development of postsecondary education, the New York State Board of Regents declared that certain "academic matters must remain outside the purview of [collective bargaining] negotiation." (p. 94). The Board identified these academic matters as faculty tenure, curriculum development and revision, the processes of faculty evaluation and promotion, student-faculty ratios and class size, and administrative or academic organizational structure.

There is ample evidence that many persons fear that collective bargaining cannot be made to work alongside faculty participation in academic governance. I believe these fears to be justified. Indeed, I would assert that faculty collective bargaining is a form of academic governance and that in time collective bargaining agreements will find it necessary to include academic affairs as a part of the economic affairs with which these agreements are primarily supposed to be concerned. Economic benefits cannot be separated from concerns with faculty workload, faculty personnel policies, instructional practices, institutional income, and institutional costs. Moreover, contract agreements must be enforced if they are to be effective. Enforcement means management supervision, in my opinion.

I believe faculties will have to make a choice. They can be participants in an academic community. Or they can be professional employees of an academic enterprise whose conditions of work and whose work performance are specified in a collective bargaining agreement. The president and his administrative asso-

ciates then become management in what is essentially an adversary relationship as well as a supervisory relationship. Administration must do more than simply enforce the terms of a collective bargaining agreement. Administration defines the objectives of the enterprise, determines desired program outputs, and ensures performance of those outputs. The role of Administration becomes much more pervasive in a collective bargaining system, it seems to me, than in an academic governance system.

ORGANIZATION

Whenever it is desirable to formalize the structure of governance, it is probably desirable also to specify the organizational outlines of the enterprise. This action then removes the organizational structure from the realm of future conflict within the community council, or at least specifies a structure upon which the community council may improve. Often the organization of a college or university will have been set forth in older documents, and the issue of whether or not the old structure of organization remains in effect may arise after a new structure of governance is instituted. This issue can be resolved at the outset by including the institution's organizational outline in the ordinance of government itself.

Initially the structure of governance is likely to incorporate simply the existing organization of a college or university. There is likely to be such argument within the academic community about governance that the political strategy of the moment may suggest the desirability of avoiding organizational issues as well. But the occasion of framing an ordinance of government provides an opportunity to address organizational situations which may have been troublesome for some time. If change is the order of the day, as much change as possible may be the preferable strategy.

In terms of organizational structure the most troublesome issue pertains to the disciplines of the arts and sciences. In a general baccalaureate college these disciplines will argue that they are the college. In a university these disciplines may be a sizeable part of the entire faculty. The choice within a college involves the desirability of grouping the disciplines into divisions. The choice within a university involves the desirability of grouping the disciplines into several colleges or faculties. Within a university in particular it is often overlooked that the departments of the academic disciplines may be engaged in several different instructional programs: general education, liberal education, a master's degree program, and a doctor's degree program. The disciplines, and the departments which represent them, are in fact a resource for the accomplishment of these instructional programs.

Within a university, the disciplines should be grouped together as faculties, each headed by a dean. The planning and management of instructional programs in the arts and sciences should be performed from the level of the vice-president for academic affairs. If it is desirable to have a college of general studies and a college of liberal studies as degree-granting mechanisms, I think these might well

be a curricular organization rather than a departmental organization. In any event, colleges and universities developing a new structure of governance might well ask at the same time what they expect to accomplish in undergraduate instruction in the arts and sciences.

It has been customary in most universities in recent years to create a variety of institutes, centers, and other units. These may be devices for organizing interdisciplinary instructional programs, for performing certain research projects, or for carrying out certain public service projects. These devices may be located in the organizational structure under the direct supervision of the vice-president for academic affairs, a faculty or college dean, or a department chairman. It is probably desirable from time to time to review the continuing utility of all these devices, and this can be better accomplished if their structure is not written into an ordinance of government.

With colleges and universities there are several academic support services, such as the office of admissions, the library, and the office of registrar. These are essential to the operation of the academic enterprise and their place in the organizational structure needs to be clarified. The same observation may be made about the student support services and the institutional support services.

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Undoubtedly a major objective in efforts to restructure college and university governance in recent years has been to limit or curtail the authority of the president. At the same time, as I have commented earlier, little thought has been given to the need or arrangement for leadership within an academic community. I do not see how this leadership can be provided by any person other than the college or university president. When a formalized community council has been established for legislative purposes, the scope of the president's authority has in fact been considerably circumscribed. To go any farther and additionally to limit the authority of the president is highly undesirable. On the contrary, the real concern of constitution makers should be how to strengthen the role of the president in relation to a community council.

One possible method is to provide for an executive committee within a community council and to give this committee the authority to control the agenda of the council. The president should then be the chairman of this executive committee. Another important mechanism for presidential leadership is to provide him or her with the major role in preparing the college or university budget. Another essential provision, I believe, is to assert the primacy of the presidential role in emergency management.

At the same time, when the president's leadership role is being broadened to include a community council in addition to a lay governing board, it may well be appropriate to consider the desirability of limiting the term of service for any individual in the presidential role. There has been a tendency in a number of instances, including the entire multicampus system of the State University of New York, to fix a definite term of office for a president, to provide for a review

of performance at the end of that term, and to limit reappointment after such review to one additional term. If this practice is adopted, I think it is essential for a college or university to make provision for the employment security of the person who has served in this role.

Along with leadership of the academic community a structure of government needs to be equally concerned with management. Strengthened management is as essential as strengthened leadership. It seems necessary that the overall authority for management should be vested in the president. There remains the task of defining the management roles for academic affairs, including the support services. It has become more or less customary practice for these roles to be filled by vice-presidents of a college or university, and for the president to appoint these officers subject to approval by the governing board.

In the instance of the vice-president for academic affairs it is traditional in many colleges and universities for the president to select this officer only after extensive consultation with faculty members. This consultation may be informal, or it may be formalized by means of an advisory selection committee. Presumably, the vice-president for academic affairs serves at the pleasure of the president, but in some instances the term of office may be quite lengthy. It is somewhat surprising to me to note the absence in many colleges and universities of any widespread faculty interest in electing and limiting the term of service for this officer. I am inclined to believe that this lack of interest may reflect an expectation that the vice-president for academic affairs will become the loyal associate of the president rather than a faculty leader.

The desirability of faculty election of the vice-president for faculty affairs, as well as for the election of academic deans and of department chairmen, deserves consideration for several reasons. One is that election would clarify the responsibility of these positions in terms of faculty relationships. The obligation of presidential consultation would give way to faculty responsibility for selection. Secondly, the leadership and management role of these positions in academic affairs might be strengthened if the individuals are considered to be representatives of the faculty rather than of the president. Thirdly, faculty members would have only their own failure to blame if the performance of individuals in these leadership roles was less than satisfactory.

I recognize that this kind of proposal is a radical departure from current practice. At the same time, I believe upon the basis of current observation that academic management is so generally inadequate on many campuses that only some radical solution can hope to improve the situation. Moreover, some formalized limitation upon the term of service in these management roles is probably desirable as a means of regularizing what appears to be an informal trend toward such limitation. One objection to faculty election as against presidential appointment of these positions is that the former arrangement will weaken presidential leadership. This might be the result, but I wonder if the presidential role will be any less effective if faculty responsibility for these positions is made explicit rather than implicit at the present time. Faculty election will also mean a tendency to internal rather than external choice. This is not inevitable under the arrangement, however, and can be avoided if need be.

With faculty election of academic vice-presidents, deans, and department

chairmen, I would hope that their management authority and role would receive greater attention and acceptability. The primary role of these academic managers is to carry out the programs authorized by the legislative authority of the college or university. Their role is one of management, to get work done, and of course to recommend how work may be more effectively and efficiently performed. I think it is essential that academic managers associate advisory councils with their managerial activity, and that these councils consist of both faculty and students. I do not see these academic managers as exercising a legislative role; that authority should be entrusted exclusively to the college or university community council. I do see these officers exercising a greater authority over work operations and over the utilization of work resources needed to produce the desired outcomes of the academic enterprise.

The personnel structure of colleges and universities has long been a patchwork of divergent categories and requirements. While arrangements for the careful management of nonacademic positions have become fairly common, these have not usually included professional positions and faculty positions. Uniform provisions for a comprehensive structure of personnel management are now needed in many colleges and universities, and the restructuring of governance offers an opportunity to emphasize the importance of personnel management in the academic community.

JUDICIARY

Colleges and universities have had a long history of enforcing certain codes of student behavior, although courts of law in recent years have found some provisions of these codes to be unreasonably vague and the enforcement of these codes to violate the rudimentary requirements of due process of law. Although the tenure standards of the American Association of University Professors have recognized occasional circumstances that may justify a dismissal action against a faculty member, the procedure required has involved the use of a faculty review committee rather than a judicial procedure.

In recent years some colleges and universities have found the appointment of an ombudsman a useful counterweight to the charge that institutions are becoming too large, too impersonal, too bound by routine to give proper attention to individual personal problems. The creation of the position of ombudsman is an organizational arrangement for handling individual grievances. When unions of operating staff have been formed and have engaged in collective bargaining with college or university officials, the creation of grievance machinery has usually been an important part of an agreement. Similarly, when faculty collective bargaining agreements have been entered into by colleges and universities, some kind of grievance procedure has usually been included. But students and faculty members not covered by collective bargaining agreements may sense the need for some formalized grievance arrangement, and the creation of the position of ombudsman meets this need.

It seems likely that with the increased disposition of the courts to inquire

into the procedures of colleges and universities, it will be necessary for institutions of higher education to give more careful attention to their disciplinary practices. This requirement can be met by the establishment of a formalized judiciary structure, and this kind of arrangement has been included in some instruments of governance. A judiciary is as essential as a legislative and an executive process in academic government.

The text of an ordinance of government that follows this discussion is not intended to be more than an illustration of the scope and range of issues to be resolved when restructuring of governance is undertaken. The language offered is simply presented as a guide, and as a standard against which to judge the adequacy or inadequacy of various instruments of government adopted in recent years. Constitution-making is a new experience for many colleges and universities, and will continue to be a major concern for many years.

71172

AN ORDINANCE

OF GOVERNMENT

73/74

PREAMBLE

In order to form a more effective community of diverse interests and competencies, to establish justice in all relationships among members of the University community, to ensure the resolution of all conflict through reason and orderly procedure, to provide for the perpetuation of the University community in undiminished vigor and resources, to promote the educational purposes for which this community was founded and for which it is sustained, and to secure the benefits of academic freedom for all who are or who may become participants in this community, the Board of Trustees does hereby ordain the establishment of this Structure of Government for the University.

ARTICLE I. PURPOSES AND PROGRAM POLICIES

The University is an academic community for the education of students, the pursuit of scholarship and creative activity, the supply of ideas, skills, and cultural resources, the constructive evaluation of social performance, and the promotion of equality of educational opportunity. The University is a resource provided and supported by society for use by individuals committed to the highest ideals of scholarship, esthetics, and humane purposes to which mankind can aspire. As such, the University seeks to attract and cultivate men and women of intellectual promise and of personal competence and to develop their potentialities as human beings to the fullest extent possible. In return for these efforts, society can expect to obtain from the University increased knowledge and informed, sensitive, and vigorous individuals prepared to help achieve improvement in the condition of man.

In its endeavor to achieve these purposes, the University is pledged to observance of the following policies:

1. Equal opportunity of access to all the programs of the University without discrimination based upon sex, age, race, creed, national origin, or socioeconomic status.

2. Equal opportunity for employment in all activities of the University without discrimination based upon sex, age, race, creed, national origin, or socioeconomic status.

3. The performance of all programs and services in the most effective and efficient manner possible, consistent with other objectives, not only by the

use of advanced techniques of management but also by the use of improved techniques of work performance.

4. The operation of a structure of government providing maximum authority and responsibility to faculty, professional staff, operating staff, and students in the development of programs, in the formulation of standards of operation, and in the determination of budgets of income and expense.

5. The maintenance of a physical campus environment which shall be esthetically satisfying and to the fullest extent possible free from any form of pollution for the surrounding environment.

6. Cooperation with civic, professional, voluntary, community, and governmental agencies to the fullest extent possible in achieving goals of social betterment consistent with the purposes of the University.

In undertaking to accomplish its general purposes, the development and operation of the programs of the University shall observe the following program policies:

1. Instruction

a. The maintenance of a balanced curriculum in the arts and sciences which shall enable the undergraduate student to acquire an understanding of man and his universe, an appreciation of the intellectual and esthetic achievements of mankind, and an ability to contribute as informed, rational, and sentient beings to the culture and progress of a changing world.

b. The provision of specialized programs in the arts and sciences which shall enable the graduate student to acquire the knowledge and skills for the effective communication of knowledge, the advancement of knowledge, and the application of knowledge to contemporary social problems critical to the enhancement of freedom and to the welfare and survival of man.

c. The offering of professional programs from the undergraduate to the most advanced level of formal preparation for practice in those professions and in those applied and performing arts advantageous for the welfare of society and determined to be appropriate for the endeavor of the University.

d. The introduction of innovative and additional programs of instruction which meet specified needs of society, which afford promise of more effective education of the individual, and which can be provided at a high level of quality with currently available resources of personnel and facilities or which have assurance of obtaining the necessary augmented resources.

2. The Conduct of Research and Creative Activity

The encouragement of research and creative activity in all areas of instruction, based upon the following standards: (1) Research and creative activity must conform to professional standards of performance and usefulness in advancing knowledge or the esthetic stock of society. (2) Research and creative activity must not be destructive of human values. (3) Research and creative activity shall be available for judgment by one's professional peers. (4) Research and creative activity shall be related to the educational purposes of the University. (5) Research and creative activity shall be pursued within the limits of the financial and facility resources of the University.

3. Public Service

The performance of public service programs involving continuing education, extension education, clinical activities, dramatic and artistic presentations, public broadcasting, museums and exhibition galleries, advice and consultation with groups and enterprises by the professional staff and students of the University in accordance with the following standards: (1) The University's name shall be associated with public service activities only to the extent authorized by the legislative authority of the University. (2) The professional staff shall engage in external public service activity only to the extent authorized by the legislative authority of the University or imposed by external legislation. (3) Students as students shall engage in public service activity only to the extent authorized in accordance with an approved program of instruction.

4. Academic Support

The provision of library services, audio-visual service, computing service, admissions service, registration and student records service in accordance with the needs of approved instructional, research, and public service programs.

5. Student Services

a. The provision of such services to students involving counseling, advising, health care, recreation, cultural performances, intercollegiate athletics, food service, housing service, and the sale of supplies and equipment as shall be indispensable to the realization of the educational mission of the University.

b. The encouragement of the maximum possible degree of self-government and self-financing of student social groups.

c. Assistance in organizing and maintaining such student activities and structures as are directly involved in the performance of the educational mission of the University.

6. Student Financial Assistance

The provision of financial assistance to students in order to enable all qualified applicants to enroll without regard to socioeconomic status up to the limits of governmental, gift, and general financial resources available to the University for such purpose.

7. Institutional Support

The provision of fiscal, plant, security, purchasing, communication, transportation, publication, and management services as needed to preserve the assets and to ensure continuing, efficient, and effective operation of the University.

ARTICLE II. THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

1. Composition.

The Board of Trustees is comprised of twenty-four members who are elected by the board. In the election of members, the board pledges itself to observe the following procedures:

a. All terms of service shall be limited to six years, the terms of eight members expiring every two years. A member may be elected to serve a second term of six years but no member shall be elected to serve as a trustee more than a total of twelve years.

b. In electing its membership board members shall be divided into three classes of eight persons each: general members, alumni members, and public members. There shall be no distinction in authority or participation as members of the board among the three classes. The board agrees to elect as alumni members eight persons from among those nominated by the alumni association in accordance with the rules of the association. The board agrees to elect as public members eight persons from among those nominated by the governor of this state. The board will elect as general members eight persons nominated by a committee of the board including members from all three classes of membership.

2. Authority.

The Board of Trustees is vested by provision of law with the authority of government within the university. In the exercise of this authority the board shall:

a. Appoint a President, as hereinafter provided, with the advice and consultation of the University Community Council.

b. Enact an annual budget of income and expenditure for the current operation of the University and a capital improvement budget, upon recommendation of the President.

c. Determine policies for and supervise the management of the endowment of the University in accordance with the stipulations of each individual donor, and approve programs of gift solicitation on behalf of the University.

d. Review and approve or disapprove the legislation of the University Community Council.

e. Review the academic and management performance of the President as hereinafter provided.

f. Establish procedures for the emergency management of the University in a time of clear and present danger of the disruption of legally authorized activities or of damage to University property or of a threat to the safety of persons comprising the academic community.

ARTICLE III. THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY COUNCIL

1. There is hereby established the University Community Council to be composed of seventy-five persons as follows: twenty-five faculty members elected as hereinafter provided; twenty-five students as hereinafter provided; five representatives of the professional staff as hereinafter provided; five representatives of the operating staff as hereinafter provided; the ten academic deans serving *ex officio;* and the president and four vice-presidents serving *ex officio.*

2. The University Community Council shall have authority to enact legislation, subject to the review and approval of the board of trustees, on the following matters: (a) Policy procedures to implement the purposes and basic policies set forth in this Ordinance of Government. (b) Organizational structure of the University consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance. (c) Personnel policies and procedures for staffing the University in accordance with the manning tables and compensation schedules of the current operating budget. (d) Codes of conduct for faculty members and students. Professional staff members and administrators shall be expected to conform to the faculty code of conduct. Operating staff members shall be expected to conform to codes of conduct prescribed for civil service employees of state government. (e) All other matters of general university-wide interest not inconsistent with the provisions of this Ordinance. (f) Internal operating procedure and committee structure not inconsistent with the provisions of this Ordinance.

3. The University Community Council shall consider the annual budget for current operations and the capital improvement budget as formulated by the President and shall submit recommendations thereon to the Board of Trustees.

4. The University Community Council shall render service and consultation to the President and to the Board of Trustees as requested by them.

5. The University Community Council shall meet once a month at a time fixed by the Council, except that meetings need not be held during June, July, and August. The University Community Council shall meet in special sessions as called by the Speaker.

6. The University Community Council shall elect from its membership a presiding officer to be designated as Speaker. The Speaker shall preside at all meetings of the community council in a fair and impartial manner, shall maintain order and decorum at all meetings, shall call special meetings of the community council upon request of the executive committee, shall see that an appropriate record of all transactions is maintained, and shall communicate all actions of the community council to the Board of Trustees. The Speaker shall not participate in debate but shall have a vote in case of a tie.

7. The University Community Council shall establish standing committees as follows: a committee on academic affairs, a committee on student affairs, a committee on operations, a committee on planning and budgeting, and a committee on personnel.

8. There shall be an executive committee of the University Community Council to be composed of the President of the University as chairman and including the vice-president for academic affairs, the chairman of the faculty forum as hereinafter provided, the chairman of the student forum as hereinafter provided, one representative jointly nominated by the council members who represent the professional and operating staff, and two faculty members nominated by the faculty forum and two student members nominated by the student forum of whom one shall be a graduate or graduate professional student. The executive committee shall assign proposed legislation to standing committees, shall determine the agenda for the meetings of the community council, shall serve as an advisory committee to the President, and shall take interim action between regular meetings of the community council.

9. There shall be a faculty forum of the community council which shall consist of the twenty-five faculty representatives elected to the community council. The faculty forum shall elect one of its members as chairman. The faculty forum shall organize and conduct elections of faculty representatives as hereinafter provided. The faculty forum shall meet upon call of the chairman and may invite all members of the faculty to meet with it in order to discuss faculty affairs of university-wide concern and to indicate desirable university-wide legislation. No individual faculty member of the faculty forum is obligated to vote in the University Community Council in accordance with the position of the majority of the forum or of the faculty participating in any forum discussion.

10. There shall be a student forum of the community council which shall consist of the twenty-five student representatives elected to the community council. The student forum shall elect one of its members as chairman. The student forum shall organize and conduct elections of student representatives as hereinafter provided. The student forum shall meet upon call of the chairman. The forum may invite presidents or other representatives from designated student organizations to meet with it and to discuss student affairs of university-wide concern. No individual member of the student forum is obligated to vote in the University Community Council in accordance with the position of the majority of the student forum.

11. The twenty-five faculty members of the University Community Council shall be elected by a majority vote of all faculty members voting in single member districts which shall comprise an approximately equal number of persons totaling four percentum of all faculty members. For purposes of representation and the election of representatives in the University Community Council, faculty members shall be those persons holding appointment in the University as professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor, or an adjunct or research appointment of the same rank and engaged in classroom instruction or in research activity equal to half-time or more of a full-time position. Insofar as possible all members of a single instructional department shall be included in an election district. For the initial election and until the faculty forum shall be organized, the President shall determine the initial election districts and shall conduct the first election of faculty representatives.

12. The twenty-five student members of the University Community Council shall be elected by majority vote of students eligible to vote and voting from single member districts which shall comprise an approximately equal number of students totaling four percentum of all students. For purposes of representation and the election of representatives in the University Community Council, students shall be all those persons enrolled in a degree program of the University, making satisfactory progress toward a degree, and enrolled in instructional courses of not less than six credit hours per semester. Insofar as possible, students enrolled in the same faculty or college shall be included in the same election district or districts. For the initial election and until the student forum shall be organized, the President shall determine the initial election districts and shall conduct the first election of student representatives.

13. The professional staff of the University shall consist of directors of academic support services, student support services, and institutional support services and their associates who have the educational preparation of a baccalaureate or higher degree, and are engaged in activities commonly accepted in academic practice as having professional status. Such positions shall be initially identified by the President and shall be approved by the Board of Trustees. The operating staff shall be all other personnel employed by the University in a non-instructional work assignment. For purposes of representation and of electing representatives the professional staff and the operating staff shall consist of all persons employed by the University in these two classifications on at least a half-time basis. The President shall divide these positions into approximately equally sized election districts, five for professional staff and five for the operating staff, and the eligible voters shall by majority vote of those voting elect representatives to the University Community Council. The President shall arrange such elections.

ARTICLE IV. FACULTIES, COLLEGES, DEPARTMENTS AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT

1. The University shall be organized for the performance of its educational programs into the following faculties and colleges: the Faculty of the Humanities, the Faculty of the Social and Behavioral Sciences, the Faculty of the Biological Sciences, the Faculty of the Physical Sciences and Mathematics, the College of Administrative Sciences, the College of Education, the College of Engineering, the College of Fine and Applied Arts, the College of Law, the College of Medicine, and the College of Nursing and Health Professions.

2. Each faculty and college shall be comprised of such departments, schools, research centers, institutes, and other operating units as may be authorized by legislation.

3. The academic support services of the University shall include: an Office of Admissions, a Division of Registration and Student Record Services, a

Division of Libraries and Learning Resources, an Audio-Visual Service, and such other services as may be authorized by legislation.

4. Each faculty, college, and support service shall perform such instructional and other services as may be assigned to it by legislation. The scope and magnitude of all activities shall be set forth in the annual budget for current operations and shall be conducted within the limits of special income and general income available to each program or activity.

ARTICLE V. STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

1. The University shall be organized for the performance of its student support programs into the following services: the Student Counseling Service, the Student Health Service, the Student Financial Assistance Service, the Student Recreational Service, the Student Cultural Service, the Student Housing Service, the Intercollegiate Athletic Service, the Student General Service, and such other services as may be authorized by legislation.

2. The University shall be organized for the performance of its institutional support programs into the following services: the Office of Treasurer, the Accounting Service, the Supply Service, the Computing Service, the Personnel Service, the Plant Service, the Security Service, the Administrative Service, and such other services as may be authorized by legislation.

3. Each student support service and institutional support service shall be headed by a director or manager with an appropriate designation. Each service shall perform such programs and activities as may be assigned by legislation. The scope and magnitude of all activities shall be set forth in the annual budget for current operations and shall be conducted within the limits of special income and general income available to each program or activity.

ARTICLE VI. THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

1. The executive authority of the University is vested in the President, who shall have general duties of leadership and of management embracing all policies, programs, work operations, and supporting services.

2. The president shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees, with the advice and consultation of the University Community Council, for a term of five years. The President shall have rank as a full professor in an academic department appropriate to his or her academic education and experience. The President may be appointed to a second five-year term by the Board of Trustees, with the advice and consultation of the University Community Council and after a review of performance in the position. Upon the completion of a term of service as President, the individual shall revert to status as a professor at the rate of compensation of the highest paid professor on a ten

month's contract of service within the University.

3. The President shall: (a) Advise the Board of Trustees about all matters of concern to the board. (b) Advise the University Community Council about all matters of concern to the council. (c) Serve as chairman of the executive committee of the University Community Council. (d) Prepare an annual budget of income and expenditure for current operations and prepare a budget for capital improvements and submit these for consideration to the University Community Council and for approval by the Board of Trustees. (e) Appoint the heads of staff offices to assist the President including a Vice-President for Planning and Budgeting, an Office of Development, and Office of Legal Counsel. (f) Appoint a Vice-President for Student Services and a Vice-President for Operations and approve the appointment of directors of services assigned to these vice-presidents for management direction. (g) Supervise all management activities to ensure the effective and efficient performance of all University programs and activities. (h) Declare a state of emergency in the case of a clear and present danger of University disruption and of a threat of destruction to University property and of damage to the person of any member of the University community and perform such duties of emergency management as shall be authorized by legislation of the Board of Trustees. (i) Perform such other duties as may be delegated by action of the Board of Trustees or of the University Community Council.

ARTICLE VII. MANAGEMENT OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

1. The management of educational programs of the University is vested in a Vice-President for Academic Affairs, under the general supervision of the President, in academic deans, and in department chairmen.

2. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs shall be elected by the Faculty Forum for a five-year term of office. The Vice-President may be re-elected for a second five-year term. At the conclusion of a period of service the individual holding the position shall revert to the status of a professor in the department or college of his or her initial appointment in the University at a rate of compensation not less than the average for all professors in the University on a ten month's contract. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs shall: (a) Supervise the operation of all instructional and other educational programs of the University. (b) Appoint the directors of all academic support activities, with the approval of the President. (c) Appoint an Advisory Council on Academic Affairs which shall include faculty and student members to consult about desirable changes in educational programs. (d) Appoint such staff associates as may be approved by the President, including a Deputy Vice-President for General Education, a Deputy Vice-President for Baccalaureate Programs, a Deputy Vice-President for Graduate Programs and Research, a Deputy Vice-President for Medical and Health Affairs, and a Deputy Vice-President for Public Services. (e) Prepare an annual budget for current operations of educa-

tional programs and recommend this to the President. (f) R commend desirable legislation on academic affairs to the President and the University Community Council. (g) Perform such other activities as may be requested by the President or the University Community Council.

3. The four academic faculties and the six academic colleges shall each be managed by a dean who shall serve for a five-year term of office and who shall be elected by the faculty members of the faculties and colleges eligible to vote for representatives in the University Community Council. A dean may be re-elected for one additional five-year term of office. Upon completion of the term of office the dean shall have status as a professor in the department of his or her academic appointment. The dean shall exercise the authority of management within a faculty or college, under the general supervision of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The dean shall appoint an advisory council of faculty members and students to consult about the educational affairs of the faculty or college. The dean shall appoint directors for such institutes, centers, and programs as may be authorized for operation within a faculty or college and shall perform such other duties as may be requested by the President, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, or the University Community Council.

4. Each academic department within a faculty or college shall be managed by a department chairman who shall serve for a five-year term of office and who shall be elected by the faculty members of the department eligible to vote for representatives in the University Community Council. A department chairman may be re-elected for one additional five-year term of office. Upon completion of the term of office the department chairman shall have status as a professor in the department. The department chairman shall exercise the authority of management within the department under the general supervision of the dean of the faculty or college. The department chairman shall appoint an advisory committee of faculty members and of students to consult about the educational affairs of the department. The department chairman shall perform such other duties as may be requested by the dean.

5. The management of student support programs of the University is vested in a Vice-President for Student Affairs, under the general supervision of the President. The Vice-President for Student Affairs shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at his or her pleasure. The Vice-President shall appoint the directors of all student support services, with the approval of the President. The Vice-President shall appoint an advisory council on student affairs of faculty and student members to consult about the student affairs of the University. The Vice-President shall recommend to the President an annual budget of income and expenditures for student support services. The Vice-President shall recommend to the President desirable legislation affecting the operation of student support services and the operation of activities by student organizations. The Vice-President shall perform such other activities as may be requested by the President or the University Community Council. The management authority of particular student support services shall be exercised by the directors thereof, under the general supervision of the Vice-President for Student Affairs.

6. The management of institutional support services of the University is vested in the Vice-President for Operations under the general supervision of the President. The Vice-President for Operations shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at his or her pleasure. The Vice-President shall appoint the directors of all institutional support services, with the approval of the President. The Vice-President shall recommend to the President an annual budget of income and expenditures for institutional support services. The Vice-President shall recommend to the President desirable legislation affecting the operation of institutional support services. The Vice-President shall perform such other activities as may be requested by the President or the University Community Council. The management authority of particular institutional support services shall be exercised by the directors thereof, under the general supervision of the Vice-President for Operations.

ARTICLE VIII. UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL

1. The staffing of the University shall consist of the following categories of personnel: administrative officers (President and vice-presidents); faculty officers (deputy vice-presidents for educational activities, deans, department chairmen, professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, research and adjunct personnel of faculty rank, teaching assistants, and research assistants); professional officers (directors of academic support services, student support services, and institutional support services and their associates having professional status); and operating personnel (clerical, fiscal, secretarial, housekeeping, custodial, security, and skilled trades). The personnel structure of the University within these principal categories and group titles shall be established by legislation.

2. Procedures for the recruitment, appointment, development, promotion, compensation, separation, and retirement of personnel shall be provided by legislation.

3. The President shall establish a table of staffing positions for each academic and other organizational unit of the University as a part of the annual budget for current operations. After approval of this staffing table by the Board of Trustees, the President may make adjustments in the table without an increase in the personnel compensation requirements of the budget, or the President may delegate the authority to make such adjustments to the vice-presidents.

ARTICLE XI. JUDICIAL PROVISIONS

1. An office of Ombudsman is hereby established to assist personnel and students with complaints about unresolved issues presented to the proper departments and other offices of the University. The Ombudsman shall be

appointed by the President with the approval of the University Community Council and shall serve at the pleasure of the community council. The Ombudsman shall investigate all complaints, bring findings and recommendations to the appropriate offices of the University, and report about the activities of the office at least semi-annually to the community council.

2. To ensure due process and justice to all students and personnel of the University, there is hereby established the University Judicial System, which shall consist of a Judicial Officer and appropriate courts appointed by the President with the approval of the University Community Council. The Judicial Officer shall serve at the pleasure of the community council. The Judicial Officer shall have authority to establish faculty personnel courts on an ad hoc basis to hear any charges of a violation of a faculty code of conduct, and may review the decisions of such faculty personnel courts before submitting a recommendation for approval or disapproval for transmission by the President to the Board of Trustees. The Judicial Officer shall have authority to establish such student conduct courts as may be necessary to hear any charges of a violation of a student code of conduct, and may review the decisions of student conduct courts, affirming or modifying such decisions.

ARTICLE X. AMENDMENTS

This Ordinance of Government may be amended from time to time by the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the University Community Council or upon recommendation of the President and after a public hearing on the proposed amendment.

Bibliography

American Association of University Professors. "Faculty Participation in College and University Government." *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, 1960, *46*, 203-204.

American Association of University Professors. "Statement of Government of Colleges and Universities." *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, 1966, *52*, 375-379.

American Council on Education. *College and University Business Administration.* (rev. ed.) Washington, D.C., 1968.

Anderson, E. L. "Trusteeship–A Changing Concept." *AGB Reports*, 1973,*16*, 2-7.

Andes, J. *A Systems Approach to University Organization.* Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1970.

Assembly on University Goals and Governance, The. *A First Report.* Cambridge, Mass.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1971.

Baldridge, J. V. (Ed.) *Academic Governance.* Berkeley: McCutchan, 1971a.

Baldridge, J. V. *Power and Conflict in the University.* New York: Wiley, 1971b.

Barnard, C. A. *The Functions of the Executive.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Beck, H. P. *Men Who Control Our Universities.* New York: King's Crown Press, 1947.

Bell, D. *The Post-Industrial Society.* New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Bennis, W. *The Leaning Ivory Tower.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973a.

Bennis, W. "The University Leader." *Saturday Review Education*, 1973b, *55*, 42-50.

Berdahl, R. O. *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Berelson, B., and Steiner, G. A. *Human Behavior.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1964.

Besse, R. M. "A Comparison of the University with the Corporation." In J. A. Perkins, *The University as an Organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Blau, P. M. *The Organization of Academic Work.* New York: Wiley, 1973.

Bolman, F. D. *How College Presidents Are Chosen.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Boyer, R. K., and Crockett, C. (Eds.) "Organizational Development in Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education,* 1973, *44,* 339-425.

Brown, J. D. "The Human Nature of Organization." *AGB Reports,* 1966, *8,* 3-11.

Brown, J. D. "On Organization and Executive Leadership in a Liberal University." *AGB Reports,* 1966, *8,* 12-18.

Brubacher, J. S. and Rudy, W. *Higher Education in Transition: An American History, 1636-1956.* New York: Harper and Row, 1958.

Brzezinski, Z. *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era.* New York: Viking, 1970.

Burn, B. B. "Comparisons of Four Foreign Universities." In J. A. Perkins (Ed.), *The University as an Organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Burns, G. P. *Trustees in Higher Education.* New York: Independent College Funds of America, 1966.

Carmichael, O. C., Jr. *New York Establishes a State University.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1955.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *The Capitol and the Campus: A Report and Recommendations.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971a.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Dissent and Disruption: Proposals for Consideration by the Campus.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971b.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973a.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *The Purposes and the Performance of Higher Education in the United States: Approaching The Year 2000.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973b.

Carr, Robert K. and VanEyck, Daniel K. *Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.

Cheit, E. F. *The New Depression in Higher Education: A Study of Financial Conditions at Forty-one Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Clark, B. R. "Belief and Loyalty in College Organization." *The Journal of Higher Education,* 1971, *42,* 499-515.

Cleveland, H. "The Dean's Dilemma: Leadership of Equals." *Public Administration Review,* 1960, *20,* 22-27.

Cleveland, H. *The Future Executive: A Guide for Tomorrow's Managers.* New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Cohen, M. D. and March, J. G. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Commission on Postsecondary Education in Ontario. *Draft Report.* Toronto: The Queen's Printer, W. Kinmond, 1971.

Commission on the Government of the University of Toronto. *Toward Community in University Government.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Committee for Economic Development. *The Management and Financing of Colleges: A Statement by the Research and Policy Committee.* New York, 1973.

The Conference Board. *Behavioral Science: Concepts and Management Application.* New York, 1969.

The Conference Board. *Challenge to Leadership: Managing in a Changing World.* New York: Free Press, 1973.

Corbally, J. E., Jr. "Boards of Trustees in the Governance of Higher Education." *Theory into Practice,* 1970, *9,* 239-243.

Corson, J. J. "The Board of Trustees–Necessity or Anachronism?" *AGB Reports,* 1973a, *15,* 4-11.

Corson, J. J. *Governance of Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960a.

Corson, J. J. "Institutional Governance Within a System." *Educational Record,* 1973b, *54,* 107-114.

Corson, J. J. "The Modernization of the University: The Impact of Function on Governance." *The Journal of Higher Education,* 1971, *42,* 430-441.

Corson, J. J. "The University–A Contrast in Administrative Process." *Public Administration Review,* 1960b, *20,* 2-9.

Council of Ontario Universities. *Participatory Planning.* Fifth Annual Review. Toronto, 1970-1971.

Cowley, W. H. "Academic Government in Britain and the United States." *AGB Reports,* 1969, *11,* 3-15.

Cowley, W. H. "Professors, Presidents, and Trustees." *AGB Reports,* 1967, *9,* 4-25.

Craig, H. *Woodrow Wilson at Princeton.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960.

Demerath, N. J., Stephens, R. W., and Taylor, R. R. *Power, Presidents, and Professors.* New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Dodds, H. W. *The Academic President–Educator or Caretaker?* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Dodds, H. W., "Some Thoughts on the University President." *Public Administration Review,* 1960, *20,* 10-16.

Dominguez, J. I. "To Reign or Rule. A Choice for Trustees." *AGB Reports,* 1973, *15,* 2-10.

Dressel, P. L., Johnson, F. C., and Marcus, P. M. *The Confidence Crisis.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Drucker, P. F. *The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to our Changing Society.* New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Duff, J., and Berdahl, R. O. *University Government in Canada: Report of A Commission Sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Dunham, E. A. *Colleges of the Forgotten Americans: A Profile of State Colleges and Regional Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Duscha, J. and Fischer, T. *The Campus Press: Freedom and Responsibility.* Washington, D. C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1973.

Dykes, A. R. *Faculty Participation in Academic Decision-Making.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Enarson, H. L. "Tinkering with University Government." *Educational Record,* 1973, *54,* 47-50.

Fincher, C. "Planning Models and Paradigms in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 1972, *43,* 754-767.

Gardner, J. W. *The Recovery of Confidence.* New York: Norton, 1970.

Gardner, J. W. *Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society.* New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Glenny, L. A. *Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Glenny, L. A. "Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy." *AGB Reports,* 1973, *16,* 24-31.

Glenny, L. A., and Daglish, T. K. *Public Universities, State Agencies, and the Law: Constitutional Autonomy in Decline.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Gorovitz, S. "Reflections on Campus Pessimism." *Science,* 1972, *178,* 586-590.

Graubard, S. R. (Ed.) "Rights and Responsibilities: The University's Dilemma." *Daedalus,* 1970, *90,* 543-712.

Gross, B. M. *Organizations and Their Managing.* New York: Free Press, 1968.

Gross, E. "Universities as Organizations: A Study of Goals." In J. V. Baldridge, *Academic Governance.* Berkeley: McCutchan, 1971.

Hartnett, R. T. *College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes.* Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

Hatcher, H. *The Role of the Trustee in the Public University.* Urbana: University of Illinois Citizens Committee, 1962.

Heilbron, L. H. *The College and University Trustee.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Henderson, A. D. "Finding and Training Academic Administrators." *Public Administration Review,* 1960, *20,* 17-22.

Henderson, A. D. *The Role of the Governing Board.* Washington, D. C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1967.

Henry, D. D. "Accountability: To Whom, For What, By What Means?" *Educational Record,* 1972, *53,* 287-292.

Hickman, C. A. "The Faculty Voice in Institutional Policy." *AGB Reports*, 1968, *10*, 17-26.

Hodgkinson, H. L. *College Governance*. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1971.

Holmer, F. "The Anonymity of Higher Education Leadership?" *AGB Reports*, 1973, *15*, 2-5.

Howe, R. A. "Roles of Faculty." In H. L Hodgkinson and L. R. Meeth (Eds.), *Power and Authority*. San Francisco: Jossey-bass, 1971.

Hughes, R. M. *A Manual for Trustees*. Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1943.

Ikenberry, S. O. "Restructuring College and University Organization and Governance: An Introduction." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1971, *42*, 421-429.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1968.

Jenks, R. S. "Faculty-Student Participation in University Government: A Case History." *Educational Record*, 1973a, *54*, 236-242.

Jenks, R. S. "An Internal Change Agent's Role in Restructuring University Governance." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1973b, *44*, 370-379.

Johnston, R. "Student Culture and Student Power." In H. L. Hodgkinson and L. R. Meeth (Eds.), *Power and Authority*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Kahn, H. and Bruce-Briggs, B. *Things to Come: Thinking About the Seventies and Eighties*. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

Kerr, C. *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Knowles, A. S. (Ed.) *Handbook of College and University Administration: Academic*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970a.

Knowles, A. S. (Ed.) *Handbook of College and University Administration: General*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970b.

Laird, D. B., Jr. *The Regents of the University of Michigan and the Legislature of the State, 1920-1950*. Ann Arbor: School of Education, University of Michigan, 1972.

Lee, E. C., and Bowen, F. M. *The Multicampus University: A Study of Academic Governance*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Leslie, D. W. *Variability in Faculty Perception of the Legitimacy of Decision-Making at Nine Pennsylvania Institutions*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1973.

Litchfield, E. H. "The Organization of Large American Universities: The Faculties, the Administration." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1959, *30*, 353-364 and 489-504.

Lynn, K. S., and Editors of *Daedalus*. *The Professions in America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Management Division, Academy for Educational Development. *The Contributions of Business Management to Higher Education Management*. Washington, D. C., 1972.

Management Division, Academy for Education Development. *A Guide to Professional Development Opportunities for College and University Administrators.* Washington, D. C., 1973.

McConnell, T. R. "Accountability and Autonomy." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1971a, *42*, 446-463.

McConnell, T. R. "Faculty Government." In H. L. Hodgkinson and L. R. Meeth (Eds.), *Power and Authority*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971b.

McGrath, E. J. *Should Students Share the Power?* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.

Millard, R., Sweenly, K., and Eklund, N. (Eds.) *Planning and Management Practices in Higher Education: Promise or Dilemma?* Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1972.

Miller, K. I. *Evaluating Faculty Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Millett, J. D. *The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Millett, J. D. "Enterprise-Operations and Administration: Some Notes on a Systematic Theory of Organized Endeavor." *Public Administration Review*, 1967, *27*, 421-428.

Millett, J. D. *Explorations in Undergraduate Education: Why Political Science*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin No. 35, 1973.

Moran, W. A. "The Study of University Organizations." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1968, *39*, 144-151.

Mortimer, K. P. *Accountability in Higher Education*. Prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Mortimer, K. P. "The Dilemma in New Campus Governance Structures." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1971, *42*, 467-482.

National Association of College and University Business Officers. *Planning, Budgeting, and Accounting*. Washington, D. C., 1970a.

National Association of College and University Business Officers. *A Student Records Manual*. Washington, D. C., 1970b.

Nelson, C. A. "Trustees: Serve or Resign," *AGB Reports*, 1973, *15*, 12-21.

Ostar, A. W. "Public Colleges in Jeopardy?" *Compact*, 1973, *7*, 27-28.

Pandarus. "One's Own Primer of Academic Politics." *The American Scholar*, 1973, *42*, 569-592.

Parsons, T. "The Strange Case of Academic Organization." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 1971, *42*, 486-495.

Pattillo, M. M. "How to Choose a College President." *AGB Reports*, 1973, *15*, 2-8.

Perkins, J. A. "The Campus—Forgotten Field of Study." *Public Administration Review*, 1960, *20*, 1-2.

Perkins, J. A. *The University in a Restless Decade.* New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1972.

Perkins, J. A. *The University in Transition.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Peterson, M. W. "Decentralization: A Strategic Approach." *The Journal of Higher Education,* 1971, *42,* 521-539.

Porter, A. *Towards a Community University: Report of the Academic Commissioner to the Senate of the University of Western Ontario.* London, Ont.: University of Western Ontario, 1971.

Powell, R. S., Jr. "Student Power and Educational Goals." In H. L. Hodgkinson and L. R. Meeth (Eds.), *Power and Authority.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Professor X. *This Beats Working for a Living: The Dark Secrets of a College Professor.* New Rochelle, N. Y.: Arlington House, 1973.

Rauh, M. A. *College and University Trusteeship.* Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1959.

Rauh, M. A. *The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Riesman, D. and Stadtman, V. A., (Eds.) *Academic Transformation: Seventeen Institutions Under Pressure.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Rudolph, F. *The American College and University: A History.* New York: Knopf, 1962.

Sanders, I. T. "The University as a Community." In J. A. Perkins (Ed.), *The University as an Organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Schein, E. H. *Professional Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Selden, W. K. "How Long is a College President?" *Liberal Education,* 1960, *46,* 1-11.

Selden, W. K. "Some Observations on the Coordination of Higher Education at the State Level." In *Coordination and Governance of Higher Education.* Washington, D. C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1971.

Snyder, R. G. "Governing the Non-Community: The Political Economy and the Rise of the University." *The Maxwell Review,* 1972-73, *9,* 1-14.

Stoke, H. W. *The American College President.* New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Task Force on Coordination, Governance, and Structure of Postsecondary Education. *Coordination of Chaos?* Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1973.

Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiation. *Faculty Participation in Academic Governance.* Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, 1967.

Troyer, M. E. "Ventures in Reconstructing University Government: Toronto, Cornell, Syracuse." *The Maxwell Review,* 1972-73, *9,* 71-85.

Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "The Role of the College and University Trustee." *Annual Report*, 1961-1962, 1.

Uhl, N. P. *Identifying Institutional Goals.* Durham, N. C.: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971.

The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department. *Education Beyond High School.* Albany, New York: November 1972.

Veysey, L. R. *The Emergence of the American University.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. *The Study of Academic Administration.* Boulder, Colo., 1963.

Wise, W. M. "Thoughts about the Collapse of Academic Government and the Possibilities of Its Revival." In R. R. Perry and W. F. Hull IV, *The Organized Organization: The American University and Its Administration.* Toledo, Ohio: University of Toledo, 1971.

Wriston, H. M. *Academic Procession.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Zwingle, J. L. *The Lay Governing Board.* Washington, D. C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1970.

MANAGEMENT DIVISION PUBLICATIONS

BY 1990: DOUBLED ENROLLMENTS, TRIPLED COSTS. Charts showing the chronic financial squeeze with which most urban universities will have to learn to live.

MEETING THE FINANCIAL PINCH AT ONE UNIVERSITY. The university is Princeton; the saving—one million dollars—reflects the impact of Provost William Bowen's incisive memorandum explaining why the University needed to tighten its belt.

BLACK STUDIES: HOW IT WORKS AT TEN UNIVERSITIES. After the ideological furor dies down, there are these management problems to solve: organization, faculty, money.

319 WAYS COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ARE MEETING THE FINANCIAL PINCH. An expanded check-list of practices being used right now to save money and increase income.

THE ADVANTAGES OF WORK-STUDY PLANS. In addition to helping balance a university budget, work-study can attract capable students who need a chance to earn their way, and make education more relevant for all students. *(Out of print)*

SURVIVAL THROUGH CHANGE. A case study of a privately supported urban university's plan to fight the budget squeeze.

A GUIDE TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS. Fourth, expanded edition of a handbook identifying over 125 useful workshops, conferences, internships and fellowships scheduled for 1974.

RESCUE BEGINS AT HOME. Highlights of *To Turn The Tide* (Father Paul C. Reinert, President of St. Louis University), including an 11-point self-help plan other institutions can follow.

PUTTING COOPERATION TO WORK. A survey of how voluntary cooperation is helping colleges and universities.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION. Three papers discussing general scope and problems, focusing on the current issues of tenure and collective bargaining, and suggesting ways to decrease costs and increase efficiency.

HIGHER EDUCATION WITH FEWER TEACHERS. A survey of colleges and universities which have recently increased their student-faculty ratio to 20 to 1 or more, for those who are considering such a change and wondering how class size affects quality.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT TO HIGHER EDUCATION MANAGEMENT. Report of a seminar, in which higher education administrators learned from business experience without losing sight of differences between the two institutions. *(Out of print)*

FINANCING CURRENT OPERATIONS OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION. An analytical framework for comparing and contrasting the income and expenditures of publicly and privately supported colleges and universities.

ALTERNATIVES IN STATE GOVERNMENT FINANCING OF HIGHER EDUCATION. A summary of an Academy study, outlining the issues involved in the policy choices confronting all state governments and comparing the financing programs of other states.

SYSTEMS MODELS AND PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. A catalogue of management information systems and computer simulation models available for higher education current operations and long-range planning.

RESOURCE REALLOCATION IN RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES. Case studies of five research universities that reorganized their planning and budgeting efforts.

LET'S END THE CONFUSION ABOUT SIMULATION MODELS! A report of the Spring Conference of the Society for College and University Planning, including general discussion of simulation models and case-studies of simulation models at various campuses.

CONFRONTING THE NEW DEPRESSION IN HIGHER EDUCATION. Two budget exercises developed by John D. Millett, Director of the Management Division, one for "Principal College," and the other for "Major University."

A SURVIVAL KIT FOR INVISIBLE COLLEGES. The story of how one "invisible" college has met the challenge of staying alive in the period of crisis in higher education, by the President of Aquinas College, Norbert J. Hruby.

THE CAMPUS RESOURCES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. A list of all institutions of higher education by type of programs, geographical location, and affiliation.

AN OUTLINE OF CONCEPTS OF ORGANIZATION, OPERATION, AND ADMINISTRATION FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, by John D. Millett. A brief synopsis of concepts and terms useful in good management in higher education.

MANAGEMENT FORUM. Management Division newsletter containing articles and papers on higher education management and planning; each issue covers one or two current topics.

There will be a charge for quantity orders. We will be pleased to provide, at your request, information on those charges.

The Academy for Educational Development, Inc., is a nonprofit tax-exempt planning organization which pioneered in the field of long-range planning for colleges, universities, and state systems of higher education. It has conducted over 100 major studies for institutions throughout the country, as well as for national agencies such as the U.S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Agency for International Development, and the National Institutes of Health. Additional information regarding the Academy's complete program of services to education may be obtained from its offices:

New York:
680 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10019
(212) 265-3350

Palo Alto:
770 Welch Road
Palo Alto, California 94304
(415) 327-2270

Chicago:
LaSalle Hotel, Suite 222
10 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 996-2620

Washington:
1414 Twenty-second St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 265-5576

Akron:
55 Fir Hill
Akron, Ohio 44304
(216) 434-2414 or 253-8225

The Academy's Management Division was established in 1970, under grants primarily from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, to help college and university presidents and other officials improve the administration of the nation's institutions of higher learning. To achieve this purpose, the Management Division conducts research, publishes the results, and organizes conferences and professional development programs.

For further information about the Management Division, write or call:

Management Division
Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
1414 Twenty-second St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202)265-5576